



3 1761 03935 2083

VA
454
N38

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE NAVY.

A FEW CAUSES OF

ITS DECLINE

WITH SUGGESTIONS

FOR ITS REVIVAL.

VA
454
N38

73 3 1/2 of Gilders
2 1/2

P R E F A C E.

"Time, like an ever rolling stream,
Bears all its sons away;
They fly forgotten, as a dream
Dies at the opening day."

IN no page of our Nation's history do we read of so many changes, as have taken place during the last half century—The Stage Coach and Road Waggon are superseded by the *locomotive*, outstripped by speed. No longer are our Fleets which protect our sea-girt Isle, composed of the unsightly dull sailing craft which were ever dependent upon the wind for assistance, but they are composed of such *Steam Ships* as our Nation might well be proud of, either in numbers, power, speed, or armament, bidding as it were defiance to the elements, they prosecute their voyage, whether in a calm or in the storm, either for the protection of our highly favoured land, or the extension of commerce. By these means, we have thank God, opened a highway to all parts of the Navigable Globe, thrown down idolatry and superstition, extended civilization, and truth is winning its way to the utmost boundaries of our earth. So far we say all is well, and what nation could do more? At this point we might rest satisfied, if the "Lion had been brought to lay down with the Lamb," as yet, it is not so, it therefore behoves us as a Nation to be at all times prepared for coming events; and while we have the material for constituting a Navy, let us consider the personal. Learning during the past fifty years has made rapid strides, and thank God, the "British Seaman" has proved that he has a mind capable of expansion, that he is endowed with rational and intellectual senses fitted for every purpose, and worthy of cultivation, even as his fellow creatures of a different profession; consequently the British Seaman does think and act for himself, and many have acted wisely, they have improved the talent given them, and carried it to the best market, this has decimated our Navy and at times thrown us into National difficulties, over which the heads of our Nation, and the thinking of our Government have deeply lamented, and caused many to propose schemes, and recommend such measures as might in their estimation lead to a permanent Navy, the entire safety of our highly favoured Isle and widely extended Colonies. Time has not yet wrought this much desired change, the thinking part of our hardy Tars find no charm in the Royal Navy, and the Defaulter's Books could a tale unfold of the characters that have found their way into the Navy, disgraced the service, ruined good men, set discipline at defiance, and spread discontent and calumny over the four quarters of our Globe, this is one of the evils of the present day; another, much more distressing to the lover of his country, is, that merit does not meet its reward in the Navy, necessity therefore compels the meritorious to seek employment in the Merchant

Service, or in Foreign Navies, or to bind himself to the Service for ever; the latter is not generally experienced till age has put it past the power of the sufferer to seek a change: hence we see the Veterans of our Navy dragging out an existence in the ships laid up at our Home Ports, or Pensioned off upon so small a pittance, that the most menial situation is eagerly sought for to help supply nature's demands. The rising generation with the advantage of education, have a wide field open to them, and will avail themselves of the opportunity in order to receive a just recompence for their services.—If the Navy was what it might be, and what we trust shortly to see it, viz., a “HOME,” with strict discipline justly administered, a fair remuneration for service, and a due reward for merit, selecting such only as are fit to Command, it would become popular, and we might prove to a demonstration, that “*England's best Bulwarks are her Wooden Walls,*” and that the safety of our Nation is in good keeping, when our “*Wooden Walls*” are not lacking “*Hearts of Oak,*” but have always a sufficient number of British Heroes ready for every emergency that our Nation demands. Whatever affects the Warrant Officers of the Navy must affect the whole Navy, if they are of inferior ability, the Crown must suffer, the Executive branch must suffer, and the Crew lack knowledge. If they are not cared for as they should be, the situation is despised instead of sought for, and this is at last acknowledged by nearly every officer in the Navy, that the treatment towards this class of Officers during the last thirty years, has been the principal cause of the declension of the Navy. Many have been the appeals to the successive Boards of Admiralty for their improvement, but alas in vain.—In the month of June, 1858, SIR JAMES D. H. ELPHINSTONE, BART., M. P., for the Borough of Portsmouth, (with the consent of SIR JOHN PACKINGTON, First Lord of the Admiralty,) presented a Memorial to the House of Commons, Praying for a Restoration of their Widows' Pensions, of which they had been deprived in July, 1830.—While this was under consideration, Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. (at the suggestion of the Government) seeing the necessity of a permanent Navy, was pleased to appoint a Royal Commission, to enquire into the most effectual means of establishing the same, this led to the accompanying correspondence. The few facts and suggestions contained in this work, are compiled with a view that each and all may read and judge for themselves, and though the class have long and almost silently borne every burden, they have been *faithful servants* of the Crown, this is generally acknowledged by *all* who have wrote on “Manning the Navy,” or have had an opportunity of expressing their sentiments before the Royal Commission, and it is pleasing to know that on no branch of the Naval Service, was there ever higher encomiums passed than on the Gunners, Boatswains and Carpenters. Praying that they may meet their reward, and that the British Royal Navy may be such as every true hearted Briton might be proud of. And then the Compiler will be well satisfied for past labours.

CORRESPONDENCE.

*Cambridge Terrace, Lake Lane, Portsea,
13th November, 1858.*

(Private.)

MY LORD,

I am deputed by my Brother Officers, the Gunners, Boatswains and Carpenters of the Royal Navy, to address you on behalf of the Class, praying that I might be permitted to lay before you (either in a Memorial or Pamphlet) as Chairman of the Royal Commission a statement of the disadvantages under which they labour, with a view to improve their condition, and for the benefit of the Navy in general: trusting your Lordship will not deem me unworthy, but be pleased to grant my request, which I trust will lead to the means of raising the moral standard of British Seamen. Waiting your Lordship's reply,

I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient humble Servant,

THOMAS H. HOWELS, Gunner, Royal Navy.

*To Admiral the Right Honorable the Earl of Hardwicke,
Chairman of the Royal Commission on Manning the Navy,
28, Abingdon Street, Westminster.*

P.S.—I should also consider it a privilege if permitted to address a Work on Manning the Navy, to your Lordship. Be pleased to mention whether it should be a Memorial or Pamphlet.

*28, Abingdon Street, Westminster, S. W.,
24th November, 1858.*

SIR,

I am directed by the Royal Commissioners for Manning the Navy, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 13th inst., addressed to the Earl of Hardwicke, stating that you had been deputed by your brother Officers, the Gunners, Boatswains & Carpenters of the Royal Navy, to lay before the Commission a statement of the disadvantages under which they labour, with a view to improve their condition and for the benefit of the Navy in general, and I am directed in reply to state, that any statement you may forward, either in the form of a Memorial or Pamphlet, shall receive the attentive consideration of the Commission.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

H. C. ROTHERY, Secretary.

Mr. Thomas H. Howels, Gunner, R. N.

25th November, 1858.

SIR,

We humbly beg leave to request that you will be pleased to lay before the Royal Commission, the enclosed Memorial from the Warrant Officers of the Royal Navy.

We are, Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servants,

THE DEPUTATION.

THOMAS HOWELS, Gunner, R. N.,

In behalf of the Deputation.

*Henry C. Rothery, Esq ,
Secretary to the Royal Commission on Manning the Navy,
28, Abingdon Street, Westminster.*

To Admiral the Right Hon. the EARL OF HARDWICKE, Chairman of the Royal Commission on Manning the Navy.

WE, the undersigned, being deputed by our brother officers the Gunners, Boatswains, and Carpenters of the Royal Navy, do avail ourselves of the opportunity of laying before your Lordship the grievances of this Class of Officers, praying the consideration of the Royal Commission in order to improve their condition and that of the Navy in general.

Position or Rank.—Loss of.—Present Position.

For many years the position or rank of Warrant Officers was such as to command respect, and enable them at all times to perform their duties without obstruction by the Junior Officers. The loss of their Position (formerly next Masters, then next Second Masters, and lastly, in 1844, placed at the bottom of the list, and for which no reason was ever yet assigned,) is a sore grievance to the Class and a great loss to the Service. Their present position prevents them from doing their duty with alacrity and despatch, by the frequent interference of young and inexperienced officers, and a want of respect from petty officers and seamen, sometimes entailing loss of stores and endangering life; and the treatment of the class by the junior officers is a hindrance to the best petty officers accepting the warrant.

Size of Ships.—Increased Duties.

The increased size of our ships, and the scarcity of Mates and Midshipmen, have entailed many additional duties on the Gunners, such as the charge of decks, mainyard, rigging, &c., thereby occupying the time that should be devoted to their more responsible duties, viz., the care of stores and their accounts.

Have no relative Rank in the Army.—Warrant Officers as Quarter-deck Officers.

Since the Warrant Officers were deprived of position, they have lost their relative rank in the army, and with it the emoluments, such as batta money, camp money, &c., when doing duty (land service) with the army, there being no relative position assigned them, and yet during the late war with Russia, additional Warrant Officers were placed in charge of Gun-

Boats and Mortar Boats, and also as quarter-deck Officers, which duties were performed with entire satisfaction to Captains and Commanders.

Loss of Prize Money and Check Money.

Loss of position was also a loss of "prize money;" Warrant Officers were formerly in the third class, now in the fourth class, for distribution of seizures, &c.; also a loss of "check money," formerly two shillings per day, now only eighteenpence, when employed out of their own ship.

Pay.

The pay of Warrant Officers has not increased in proportion with other grades of the service (*vide* the accompanying Table), nor in proportion to the increased responsibility, the amount of Stores on charge being more than doubled within the past twenty years, particularly in the Gunners' department.

No Increase for Increased Service.

Warrant Officers have no progressive increase of pay for increased services; the officer just placed in the first class receives the same amount of pay as the one who has served twenty years in the first class.

Reduced Pay.

Warrant Officers are the *only class* in the service who serve on reduced pay; this alludes to Harbour and Dockyard duties.

Boatswain of Dockyard.

The pay of the Boatswain of a Dockyard has been reduced £50 per annum, though the size of the yards has been considerably increased, and entailed much additional labour.

Master Rigger.

The master rigger has to perform the additional duty of Boatswain of the "sheers" without increase of pay. Formerly these were separate appointments.

Widows' Pensions, Abolition of, in 1830.—Increase to others.

Until the year 1830 the Widows of Gunners, Boatswains, and Carpenters were allowed an Annuity; in that year it was abolished in prospective, and this is felt to be the *most grievous burden* that the Class have to endure, and one of the primary objections to the best petty officers accepting warrants. Since that date the widows' pensions of every other grade have been increased; the Warrant Officers, therefore, humbly pray that an Annuity be granted their Widows in proportion to their worth to the country.

Retirement, Uncertainty of.—Loss of former Time.

No length of servitude or age entitles a Warrant Officer to retirement, so long as a "medical board" pronounces him fit to serve; and then, when unfit for further service, so uncertain is the scale of superannuation that no officer is certain of the amount he will receive, and there is no remuneration for his former service as seaman and petty officer.

Wounds or Hurts.

Warrant Officers receiving wounds or hurts, and still fit to serve, were formerly allowed a pension according to the nature of the injury. This is nearly wholly abolished, nor is any additional sum granted for the same when superannuated; and should the hurt be of such a nature as to prevent them going to sea, they are placed on the "harbour duty" list, with reduced pay and reduced scale for retirement (two years' harbour service equal to one year at sea), and all future promotion stopped: so if in the second or third class, there they must remain, no matter what length of service, exemplary character, or how the hurt was received. This is an endurance which none can fully know but the sufferer.

No Rewards for War Service.

The senior Warrant Officers have no rewards for "war service," either by promotion or otherwise.

Corporal Punishment.

The Boatswains of the Royal Navy pray that they be exempted from inflicting "corporal punishment," such being degrading to the character of an officer.

DEPUTATION.

NAME.	Profession.	Ship.	Port.
Thomas Howels	Gunner	Excellent	Portsmouth.
William Andrews	"	Victory	"
Richard Spry	"	Cambridge	Devonport.
George Lumb	"	Fisgard	Woolwich.
James Pibworth	"	Wellesley	Chatham.
James Cooper	"	St. Vincent	Portsmouth.
John T. Walker	"	Royal William	Devonport.
James Carden	Boatswain	Dockyard	Portsmouth.
William Smith	"	"	Milford.
George Webber	"	St. Vincent	Portsmouth.
John Dennison	"	"	"
William Nichols	"	Royal William	Devonport.
John Grigg	"	"	"
James Uffin	"	Fisgard	Woolwich.
Stephen Moore	Carpenter	St. Vincent	Portsmouth.
John Jones	"	Victory	"
Edward Strickland	"	St. Vincent	"
Josiah V. Earl	"	Impregnable	Devonport.
William Cornish	"	Royal William	"
Jonathan May	"	Fisgard	Woolwich.
Robert Hall	"	"	"

November, 1858.

*Royal Commission for Manning the Navy,
28, Abingdon Street, S. W.,
3rd December, 1858.*

SIR,

I beg to send you herewith Twenty-five Copies of your Memorial to the Royal Commission, for the use of yourself and the other Memorialists.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
H. C. ROTHERY, Secretary.

*Mr. Thomas Howels,
Gunner, H. M. S. Excellent, Portsmouth.*

*Royal Commission for Manning the Navy,
28, Abingdon Street, S. W.,
4th December, 1858.*

SIR,

I am directed by the Royal Commissioners for Manning the Navy, to request that you will order THOMAS HOWELS, Gunner, on board H. M. S. Excellent, to attend here, on Wednesday next the 8th instant, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, for the purpose of giving Evidence on the subject of the inquiry which has been referred to them.

I am, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
H. C. ROTHERY, Secretary.

*To the Commanding Officer of H. M. S. Excellent,
Portsmouth.*

Mr. THOMAS HOWELS examined:—

3034. (*Chairman.*) What rank do you hold in Her Majesty's navy?—A gunner of the first class.

3035. Were you examined before the committee which sat in 1852?—No.

3036. You are the writer of a certain paper which was addressed to me, and it is undersigned by a certain number of boatswains, gunners, and carpenters, in Her Majesty's Navy?—Yes.

3037. You are aware, no doubt, that the object of this Commission is to facilitate by any means, without resorting to coercive measures, the manning of the royal navy in the event of necessity?—Yes.

3038. And as a means to an end, the Commissioners are very ready to hear any representations that you may have to make, tending to render the service more popular with the seamen of the country. Will you have the kindness to state what you consider to be the present objections that are made by seamen, and by those persons who rise from the rank of seamen to that of warrant officers in the service. The first point in your letter was the loss of your former position in the service?—Yes.

3039. In what year was it that you were reduced from the rank you held in the service?—Since I have been in the service, it was in 1844. That was the occasion which came most under my notice, and by which I have been a sufferer, as I was a warrant officer at that date.

3040. You are now placed under a cadet?—Yes.

3041. Formerly you ranked next to second masters?—At that date.

3042. Then your rank before was above the midshipmen?—Yes.

3043. Was it above the mates?—Not at that date; but as far back as 1825, I think it was when the former alteration took place.

3044. In the event of a ship under any circumstances losing her officers now above the rank of a cadet, the cadet would take command of the ship before the boatswain, the gunner, or the carpenter?—That is the case.

3045. The boatswain and the gunner being experienced seamen and the cadet being a child?—Yes.

3046. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) You were in the Black Sea gunner of the "Sanspareil"?—Yes.

3047. The "Tiger" was lost in the Black Sea?—Yes.

3048. What effect had the loss of rank upon the gunner of the "Tiger" when he was taken prisoner?—He was not treated as an officer; he did not receive similar allowances to an officer, as he would have in his former position.

3049. He ranked with the petty officers?—The position that he held at the bottom of the list of officers was so near approaching that of petty officers that there was scarcely any distinction made; there being no relative rank in the army for warrant officers; no position assigned by which they could receive any allowance as a prisoner of war, or any scale of diet.

3050. Consequently he suffered very considerable hardship from the loss of rank upon that occasion?—Yes, sometimes having to take his food at the servant's table.

3051. (*Mr. Green.*) Was he treated as a prisoner, like a common sailor?—Yes, in most cases.

3052. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) I suppose there is very little difference between the treatment of petty officers and of fore-mast men?—It is mostly the same.

3053. In the event of an officer being sick is not the gunner the officer who is always selected to keep the quarter-deck watch?—Always, whether in sickness or not, it invariably falls to his lot to keep that watch.

3054. In that case he commands the mate on the fore-castle, and the midshipmen, and he takes the position of a commissioned officer for the time being?—Yes.

3055. (*Chairman.*) The next point in your statement is that the duties are very much increased by the size of our ships, and by the scarcity of mates and midshipmen. Will you have the goodness to state in what way the duties are increased?—As a gunner, my lord, I can speak practically. The size of our ships and the change in the armament, within the last 20 years have more than doubled the amount of stores, and it requires double care, diligence, and attention to keep all the internal equipments, and arrangements ready for all purposes devolving on the Government. The mates and midshipmen, and formerly the mates in particular, were older servants, that is to say, they had been longer at sea, and they had had more experience, and they were frequently, indeed, almost always in charge of decks. Since the peace the mate's duty has been invariably placed on the gunner, thereby occupying his time, which should be given to that particular duty, namely constant care and attention to his stores and accounts.

3056. Do you mean to say that the gunner now does the duty of the mate of the main deck, or the mate of the lower deck?—Yes, at the present time. In some of our three-deck ships the gunner has charge of the main or middle deck, in nearly every ship in the service the gunner has charge of the main or middle deck.

3057. Is there any other point that you wish to mention?—Yes, the main yard and main rigging. This is a question I can answer to from practice. It is the gunner's mate's duty to examine, repair, and fit all the gear belonging to the main-yard and main-rigging. It is handed down as a rule that it becomes the gunner's duty, and they are occupied with this when they should be employed on different duties, particularly the stores, whereas the boatswain has the sole charge of the main-yard and rigging, and he has a chief boatswain's mate, a passed man, principally to look after the main-yard and the main-mast, and yet this duty has generally to be executed, or the principal responsibility of it rests upon the gunner for particular care and attention to the main-yard and the main-rigging.

3058. Has not the main-yard and the main-rigging, as far as the rigging on the yard and over the mast is concerned, been the charge of the gunner from time immemorial?—No, it rests principally with the captains or commanders of ships, some enforce it as a rule, others leave it as a choice to the gunner, while some never trouble themselves about it. There is nothing in the printed instructions that says that the gunner shall do it, but we are bound to obey every order that we receive, and as junior officers, we feel that we should commit a breach of discipline if we did not obey the commands of our superior officers.

3059. You are not aware that the main-yard and the main-rigging have always been the charge of the gunner?—No.

3060. Are the gunners in the service at the present time all able to take charge of the main-yard and of the main-rigging?—I should think that no gunner in the service at this day is incompetent to perform either that duty

or the duty of the boatswain, they are passed in seamanship for that purpose; they pass two examinations, one for gunner, and another for seamanship prior to getting the warrant.

3061. The boatswain has charge of all the stores in reference to the rigging of the mainmast and the main-yard?—Yes.

3062. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) The change of system is not uniform with regard to taking charge of the main-yard, for, as I am informed, in some ships the gunner is relieved from the charge of the main-yard, but the system is not uniform?—No; in the portion of the printed instructions or Queen's regulations, where the different duties are allotted, there is no such duty assigned the gunner.

3063. But it is the practice of the service?—Yes.

3064. Some ships have relieved the gunners from that practice?—Yes.

3065. Have not the improvements in gunnery in the last 20 years, and the difference in the ordnance with which the ships are armed, entailed much heavier and more onerous duties on the gunners?—Yes, the introduction of shell into the service has been one immense alteration, both as regards additional duty, and the amount of stores. The stores, now on charge, in a line-of-battle ship, are more than double in weight, and the abstract statement of the gunner that used to occupy 25 pages now numbers 160.

3066. Can you state how many tons of stores you had under your charge in the "*Sanspareil*"?—From 600 to 900 tons.

3067. Will you state the nature of these stores?—Everything in the shape of munitions of war, guns, small arms, shot, shell, powder, rockets, fuses, blue lights, revolvers of a new construction, and everything that constitutes the seamen's arms, gun breechings, and tackles, field ordnance, boats guns, &c.

3068. You consider that having such a large and onerous charge as that, it is impossible for you, consistently with the discharge of your other duties, to undertake the charge of the mainmast and mainyard, as was formerly the case?—While I am employed on the duties of the mainyard and main rigging and the decks, I must omit those more responsible duties, but if anything should be wrong I must bear all the censure and the blame, and if any deficiencies of stores must pay for them.

3069. You think that it is quite as much as one man can reasonably be called upon to perform, to have charge of the ordnance and the stores of a ship of that description?—I do, and in smaller ships equally so, as he would have *all the Drill*, and more watches to keep.

3070. (*Chairman.*) Since you have been deprived of the rank which you held formerly you have also been deprived in consequence of that of certain emoluments, have you not?—Yes.

3071. Will you state what those emoluments are, or might be, at any time?—When doing duty (land service) with the army, in our former position, we ranked with a lieutenant, and also received all the emoluments, camp money, and batta money, and so on, with them. Now we have no relative rank, and no emoluments are given, in consequence of having no relative position. This is a recent case of my own when I was doing duty on shore in the Crimea. When I did the same in China before, I received it, then ranking with the ensign or lieutenant, I forget which; but I received batta money 6s. a day, the same as an ensign or a lieutenant in the army;

but when I was doing duty in the Crimea there was no such allowance made, to the warrant officers either in the trenches or in the camp, and the midshipmen were getting, I think, £15 a quarter as camp money, but the warrant officer could be paid nothing, because they could find no rank by which to give it to him.

3072. At the same time were commands entrusted to you in preference to the midshipmen?—I had for nearly seven months the sole charge of thousands of tons of stores in Balaclava, of every description, and my successor in charge was also a gunner.

3073. Were there any officers of your rank commanding gun-boats or mortar-boats?—Yes. I am not aware that any mortar-boats were in the command of anybody else but warrant officers; the gun-boats were in command of lieutenants generally.

3074. All the mortar-boats were in command of warrant officers?—Yes.

3075. Were there also instances of warrant officers performing the duties of quarter-deck officers?—Yes, various instances, both in the Black Sea and in the Baltic.

3076. Does any instance occur to your mind, which you can adduce in corroboration of your statement?—There was the "Miranda," which Captain Lyons commanded, and he had warrant officers as quarter-deck officers. I cannot particularise the ships, but I am confident that there were more than 30 ships that had warrant officers as quarter-deck officers.

3077. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) When you were in the "Sanspareil," at Balaclava, were not several of your ship's company detached in batteries ashore?—Yes.

3078. In addition to the charge of stores which you had under your care, were you called upon to keep watch on the quarter-deck?—Yes, I and the boatswain kept the watches alternately; there were no lieutenants in the ship, they were on shore.

3079. The stores that were under your charge were on shore at Balaclava?—Yes

3080. In addition to the stores on board the ship?—Yes.

3081. You were once or twice, were you not, obliged to clear for action?—Several times.

3082. You had the entire charge both of the ship's armament on board, and the stores on shore?—Yes.

3083. For which you received no batta or remuneration whatever?—None, until the latter part of the time, when an order was given for all those who were doing duty on shore to receive check money.

3084. What did that amount to?—1s. 6d. a day for the warrant officer.

3085. While the gunner or the boatswain was doing duty as quarter-deck officer in charge of the ship, did they find any difficulty in procuring obedience from the midshipman who was their senior officer?—Yes, very great.

3086. That would lead to very great inconvenience to the public service would it not?—Most assuredly.

3087. Placed in the position in which you now are compared with that which you formerly held, how are you dealt with in reference to prize money and check money?—Formerly we were in the third class for distribution of seizures, but now that we are in the fourth class there are some

who then shared with us, who now share above us, and those who shared below, now share with us, in consequence of the change in the rank.

3088. Has any alteration been made in your pay, in consequence of the change in the rank?—Not that I am aware of in that part of it; there was a change in the pay, which took place in the year 1836, when the warrant officers were put into three classes instead of six rates, by which the whole may be said to be slightly improved, but the first rate officers in prospective lost £10 a year, all other grades were increased. When a first-class gunner, or a first-rate gunner, as he was called at that time, was receiving 5s. 7d. a day, the lieutenant was getting 6s. 6d. The lieutenant's pay has been increased to 10s., and the first-rate warrant officer, or first-class warrant officer, increased 1s., that is, making theirs 6s. 7d. the sea pay, 5s. 7d. the harbour pay.

3089. (*Chairman.*) You state in your letter as a grievance, that a warrant officer entered as a first-class warrant officer, and serving for a long period of time, as a first-class warrant officer, receives no increase of pay?—None.

3090. But would a lieutenant, a captain, or any other officer in the service, being first class, receive an increase of pay for greater length of service?—From the lieutenant downwards there is the master, surgeon, the paymaster, engineer, and others, they all receive an increase according to the length of time that they serve, as will be shown by the table accompanying the letter, viz.

Lieutenant, under 7 years,	10s. per day.	Surgeon, under 6 years,	10s. per day.
" above "	11s. "	" of 20 "	18s. "
Master of 6 years	10s. "	Paymasters according to seniority.	"
" of 20 "	18s. "	Engineers, under 6 years	10s. per day.
		" above 30 "	18s. "

3091. Then the lieutenant's pay was increased from 6s. 6d. to 10s., while the warrant officers pay was increased from 5s. 7d. to 6s. 7d.?—Yes.

3092. The next point in your letter was, "Reduced pay," what do you mean by that?—It is a term that is given to harbour pay.

3093. Would not harbour pay, in some measure, correspond with the half-pay of commissioned officers?—Yes, if all those were unfit to serve, or permitted to seek other employments; but while the warrant officer is on the sea service list, and is compelled to keep a stock of clothes ready for sea, to do the duties of the harbour, and keep watch, the dockyard duties, or whatever it may be, it is not so, for no other officer in the service is compelled to serve; take any ship in commission, and it will be found that from the captain to the boy, all have sea-pay, and the scale for superannuation is for sea-time, but they have reduced the warrant officer in pay, and reduced him in the scale for superannuation, two years in harbour equal to one at sea, if the conduct is good, or three for one otherwise.

3094. I understand the difference to be this, that whereas the commissioned officer is either actively employed or released altogether, the warrant officer is either employed at sea or actively employed in harbour?—Yes.

3095. When did the reduction in the pay of the boatswain in the dockyard take place?—On the establishment of the lieutenants of police in the dockyards. In 1834 in prospective, the master riggers and boatswains then serving continued to receive £250. while serving, but their successors came upon a reduced scale.

3096. On what class was the reduction made?—I cannot speak definitely, but it may be inferred that the lieutenant of police made an application to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for an increase of pay because the junior officer was getting more pay than he was. They did not increase the pay of the lieutenant of police at that time, but they allowed the boatswains, who were then employed, to receive the pay which they had been accustomed to receive, and they reduced the pay of their successors. And subsequently increased the lieutenant of police, to £250 per annum, although it is not mentioned in the form at the time it was printed, it should have been, that the boatswain and master riggers were both curtailed £50 per annum.

3097. What is the pay of a boatswain in Portsmouth dockyard?—£200.

3098. What is the pay of a lieutenant in Her Majesty's navy in commission?—£180 5s.

3099. Then the boatswain's pay in a dockyard is higher than that of a lieutenant in the navy now?—Yes, but the lieutenant has not the amount of responsibility, and boatswain of a yard is the height of a seaman's profession, gained by many years experience.

3100. The commissioners have been informed that one of the great grievances complained of by the warrant officer is the loss of a pension to his widow?—Yes, that is the most sore grievance of the present day, and has been for many years.

3101. How many years is it since that pension was abolished?—Twenty-eight years last June.

3102. Are you aware of the causes of its abolition?—I have heard several reasons assigned.

3103. Will you state the most prominent reasons?—That improper use had been made of it by the warrant officers marrying young women who were not the most chaste characters in the world.

3104. Did you ever hear it asserted that the warrant officers took advantage of the pension to marry also very late in life?—Not more than other grades of the service.

3105. I mean the case of a man marrying, say in his last sickness, for the purpose of securing to his nurse or his attendant a pension?—I have heard it rumoured as such, but I never knew a fact of the kind.

3106. Do you think that, to meet this asserted grievance, any arrangement could be made which should on the one hand meet the views of the warrant officers, and in some measure tend to prevent occurrences of that description?—Yes: the same rule will hold good with the warrant officers as with commissioned officers with regard to age. They are not allowed to marry beyond 60; if they do, the widows do not receive an annuity.

3107. Is that the case with all grades in the service?—Yes, all grades whose widows are entitled to annuities.

3108. They must marry if the widow is to receive a pension before they are 60 years of age?—Yes.

3109. Did you ever hear of that being proposed as the alternative instead of the total abolition of the pension?—No; when the various Boards of Admiralty have been memorialized for the restoration of the annuity, the answer generally given has been that they sympathised with the memorialists, but they had it not in their power to grant their prayer for want of an order in council, Sir Francis Baring told me, and it required another to restore it.

3110. Then previously you were in rather a better position than the commissioned officer, as you could marry at any period of life, and secure a pension to your widow, whereas the commissioned officer could not when above the age of 60?—It is only since the pension for the widow of the warrant officer was abolished, that that rule has come into force, because a commissioned officer at that time could marry at any age, the same as a warrant officer.

3111. Is it your opinion that this has been a subject of conversation among the seamen of the country, who have thought of entering Her Majesty's navy?—Yes.

3112. Do you think that a seaman looking forward to advancement in life, and to the rank of a warrant officer, is very much influenced with regard to entrance into the service, by what he may conceive to be an injury done to the rank of the warrant officer?—Yes.

3113. I apprehend that the other points to which you have referred, although they are matters of importance, do not influence the feelings of the seamen so strongly as the abolition of the widows' pension?—The warrant officer while in pay endeavours to live within the limits of his pay, but with the present small scale of pay, although he may be ever so careful a man, particularly if in the third class, and the change so great from the petty officer to the warrant officer, (for at first there is the outfit to provide for,) that it is impossible for any man to make a provision for his widow, and at his death the widow and the fatherless children, who have been raised from a humble position in life to a somewhat better position, are suddenly thrown into distress, and too many, I am sorry to say, for I have seen it, end their days in the union, I mean the widows and the fatherless children.

3114. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) Is it not the fact that an increase of pay was granted for the purpose of enabling warrant officers to effect insurances upon their lives, when their widows' pensions were taken away?—No, we never had an increase of pay, or any change for many years until the year 1836, and then there was a change from six rates to three classes. There was no change from 1836 to 1853; the petty officers and seamen's pay was increased, to the best of my knowledge, four different times, but the warrant officers' pay had not been increased one farthing until 1853, and then the increase of pay that we received was not in proportion to every other grade of officers in the service, see the accompanying table; there was no remuneration in that increase of pay to enable us to provide an annuity, and supposing there was sufficient pay to do it, we have no security apart from the Government. One bank stops payment, and another insurance society breaks, and if superannuated on a small pension obliged to forfeit the policy being unable to pay the premium.

3115. In point of fact no office would take the risk?—No, for the premiums are much greater on account of the risks of the sea.

3116. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) I think you said that for any person that might be provided you would wish to have the absolute security of the Government, and not be left to take your chance of the office in which you might happen to insure?—Yes; in order to meet the views of Her Majesty's Government, since this increase of pay was given, many warrant officers have joined various associations, such as the General Annuity Endowment Association, the Standard Life Insurance Office, and various others, and

one in which I have taken one share myself. It was £13 for a single share, for which I pay £5 a year. In the last division of profits it was reduced to £10, and I do not know that at the next division it will not come down to £8. There is no security in any place but in the Government.

3117. You think that having the security of the Government for any pension would be a great inducement to a man to enter into the service for the purpose of defending his country?—Most assuredly. There is nothing that will soothe the dying pillow of a man so much as to know that his wife and family are cared for by his country, and he will go to greater lengths to what he otherwise would, when he knows that there is something for his widow and fatherless children.

3118. Whatever it is, you think that it should rest upon the absolute security of the Government?—Yes.

3119. (*Sir J. Elphinstone*) There has been a very considerable change with regard to the knowledge and education which the Government have required on the part of warrant officers in the last 20 years?—Immense.

3120. And consequently they are improved in their social position?—Particularly so.

3121. I presume that that leads them to seek partners of an equally respectable grade in life?—Yes, I believe that the generality of the warrant officers and their wives of the present day, might bear a scrutiny with an equal number of the various grades or civilians.

3122. You do not apprehend that if the pensions were restored the measure would be ill timed or ill bestowed?—No, I have a better opinion of it. The Government have it in their power to withhold them in any profligate cases, let that power be exercised upon the guilty *only*, so that the innocent may not suffer for the guilty.

3123. Are you of opinion that this detraction from the position of the warrant officer has the effect of preventing men from looking to the warrant as the reward of faithful and steady service?—That is the principal objection, and next to that, the warrant officers do not command that respect which they did formerly. These are two very great grievances.

3124. (*Chairman.*) And yet I suppose it is generally admitted that the warrant officer of the present day has advanced with the improvement of the time as much as any other class of men in the country?—So far as has come under my own notice, after 31 years' continuous service, I believe they have in every respect.

3125. Another circumstance, I believe, affects you, which is that you are never allowed to retire until you are invalided by a medical board?—That is the case, my lord.

3126. If invalided and pronounced unfit to serve by a medical board, in what position do you find yourself for the rest of your life?—If the warrant officer should obtain his warrant when young and in good health, and be able to make up sea time enough, he would find himself in very fair circumstances; but if, on the other hand, he should be advanced in life, say thirty or thirty-five years of age when accepting the warrant, or, if he accepted it when young and happened to be injured in his first commission, he would then be obliged to serve in ordinary, so long as it was possible to serve, for the sake of the pay he would then receive, differing so much from what his scale of superannuation would be; therefore at this time there are officers serving above seventy years of age.

3127. The scale of superannuation at the age of seventy would be so much below that which he receives as an active officer that he is stimulated to go on after he feels himself unfit for the service?—Yes, or beyond the age at which a medical board may say that he is unfit for service.

3128. Is his former long service taken in to consideration upon the question of superannuation as a rule?—No. There are many instances in Portsmouth at the present day in which warrant officers have served from fifteen to twenty and twenty-four years, men and boys, and they have not received, on being superannuated, any thing for their services, but only just the scale of the warrant officer's superannuation.

3129. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) In the event of a warrant officer being broke, does he fall back upon the pension which he was entitled to for his services before the mast?—That rests principally with their lordships' decision. If he is broke out of the service he is supposed to have forfeited every thing, but in most cases they let him come back again as a petty officer, and he may then regain his position, or make up his time of twenty-one years for a pension.

3130. Is not this considered rather hard?—We think so, that we should lose the benefit of our former time. There was a circular prior to 1844, in which it said that all petty officers receiving the warrant should have the benefit of their former time for superannuation. But that circular is lost sight of; it does not appear in the printed instructions; we have nothing to fall back upon, or to prove our claim to a pension for past services.

3131. In point of fact, if a warrant officer is dismissed the service for any act, he is liable to be reduced to pauperism?—Yes; he has nothing to fall back upon.

3132. Although he may have served as a fore-mast man, and a warrant officer. For instance, you have served 31 years: suppose you were dismissed the service, now you would have no provision whatever to fall back upon?—None whatever. If I am young enough to serve, their lordships may, after making up the 21 years before the mast, give me a pension of £15 to £25 a year. If I was not fit to serve, I should get nothing.

3133. I am supposing that an educated man attains the warrant at an early age, having worked, say for five or ten years before the mast, and he unfortunately commits an act of some kind for which he is dismissed the service, and he has no pension whatever for his time before the mast; consequently, if he is an old man he becomes a burthen on the parish, and has nothing to fall back upon?—Nothing whatever.

3134. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Is not this the case, that if any officer is dismissed from Her Majesty's service he forfeits all claim to pension, half-pay, and everything, so that in that respect you are only exactly in the same position as every other officer?—If dismissed Her Majesty's service.

3135. But the hardship that you complain of is this, that if a petty officer becomes a warrant officer, more is expected of him than there was when he was a petty officer; that he perhaps may have served 19 years of his time, or may have served his whole time for a pension, and he commits himself as a warrant officer, for which he is tried and dismissed the service, and has no claim for former services?—Yes, that is one of the points.

3136. But at the same time, that in a great measure is done away with, because unless it be for some very disgraceful offence it is the rule of the

Admiralty to grant pensions for the time they have served, or to enable them to return to the service to complete their time for a pension?—In some instances that is the case, but for a warrant officer to be dismissed the service without a trial, is considered a *very hard* case.

3137. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) It operates more severely upon the warrant officer than upon the commissioned officer, in so far as the commissioned officer, in nine cases out of ten, has friends to fall back upon, but the warrant officer may be dismissed the service at a period of life when he has nothing but the workhouse open to him?—That is the case.

3138. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Then you mean to say that the seaman is deterred from wishing to be made, or from exerting himself so as to recommend himself to the position of a warrant officer, from a fear that although he may conduct himself with sufficient propriety as to maintain his character as a seaman, he may not do so as a warrant officer, and thereby he might lose all he had earned?—That is of frequent occurrence, and it is an objection to the man accepting the warrant.

3139. A gunner formerly could hardly be called an educated man, but now he is so to a very considerable degree, is he not?—Yes.

3140. You are obliged to undergo certain studies, to read certain works, and to pass certain examinations of rather a strict kind that were not formerly exacted?—Every petty officer, prior to his receiving a first-class certificate, to entitle him to a gunner's warrant, must pass through the rudiments of arithmetic, mathematics, the square and cube roots, the disparting of guns, the fitting of fuses, and everything connected with a passable or liberal education of the present day.

3141. (*Chairman.*) A passable or liberal education bearing upon his immediate calling?—Yes.

3142. The next point to which you refer in your letter, is the condition in which the warrant officer is placed, if hurt or wounded in the service. Will you first state to the Commissioners precisely what your position is with regard to hurts, and next, with regard to severe wounds?—There are numerous instances now in the service; there is one man now in Portsmouth harbour who has lost an arm, and another with his arm shattered and totally useless, and various others have hurts and injuries, for which the man with the loss of an arm has only £15 a year, and that while serving; that is he has 10d. per day for the loss of his arm, but a man before the mast, if he has just joined the service, and loses his arm, would get 1s. a day for life.

3143. The difference is, that a warrant officer will only receive his pension during the time that he is serving, and the seaman receives it for the rest of his life, serving or not serving?—There are many who receive hurts and wounds who have no pension whatever, nor anything added after the superannuation.

3144. In the present position of affairs, a seaman, if wounded, the wound being sufficient to warrant a pension, would receive that which would continue to be paid to him to the day of his death, while you say the warrant officer would only receive his pension for a similar injury during the time that he served afloat?—No; if a seaman receives a pension for wounds or hurts, and he can still serve, he must give that pension up to come into the service again, unless he is a ship's cook, ship's corporal, or master-at-arms, he cannot serve and receive the pension for wounds except in those capacities. A warrant officer, if he receives a wound or hurt, is generally

placed on the harbour duty list, and he cannot go to sea any more, then he is on reduced pay, but he gets no pension for the wound or the hurt, and he cannot gain any further advancement, for promotion is stopped when off the sea service list.

3145. Under what circumstances can a warrant officer receive a pension for a wound?—There is only one case, and that is a man that has lost his arm, of any one receiving any pension for many years past, formerly all used to receive it, and commissioned officers invariably receive pensions for wounds.

3146. Do you state positively that the pension for a wound or a hurt is not given according to any rule or principle, but that it is merely given at the caprice of some Government?—We see nothing definite to bind them, to give any certain amount.

3147. Is there no public minute which allots the various pensions to the various officers in the service for wounds or hurts?—I have seen them for seamen and petty officers, never for warrant officers.

3148. You believe that there is no regulation whatever for giving to the warrant officers of the service a pension for wounds or hurts?—I am not aware that there is.

3149. According to your statement a wounded warrant officer would be placed on a reduced scale of pay, and compelled to serve upon harbour duty, so that the wound has rather been to him a pecuniary injury, or loss, than a pecuniary advantage?—Most assuredly.

3150. And the wound also tends to lower him in his grade in the service rather than to raise him?—Yes.

3151. I presume that this is the subject of much conversation among the warrant officers?—Very much so.

3152. Have they ever appealed directly to the Government upon this point?—They have individually, I know; but I am not aware of any general appeal having been made.

3153. With reference to the rewards for active service before the enemy, do you stand on the same footing with other officers in the service?—No.

3154. Will you show to the Commissioners the difference between a commissioned officer and a warrant officer in that case?—If a warrant officer reaches the first-class, that is, the highest position he can under existing circumstances, attain, the senior of every other grade may be promoted to the next rise, but the senior warrant officer receives no promotion, no reward.

3155. Is there any other reward that he could receive and does receive?—There is the Victoria Cross, and that is as liable to be given to a third-class officer, or seaman, or any man for a deed of valour; but if you are in the first-class, the senior officer on the station, or where an action may take place, there is no reward for you beyond the boy who has just joined.

3156. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) Is there a regulation in force by which a warrant officer can be promoted to the rank of lieutenant?—There is a circular to that effect.

3157. Has that ever been acted upon?—No; though some men have been recommended in the highest terms possible.

3158. (*Chairman.*) I understand you to say that, although a rule exists which enables the Admiralty to promote to the rank of lieutenant a warrant officer, yet no instance is to be found?—None.

3159. I see that the boatswains complain of being liable to be called upon to inflict corporal punishment upon the seamen?—Yes; there have been cases in which the gunners have been ordered to do it.

3160. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Can you name the ship?—Yes, the “Centaur,” on the Coast of Africa.

3161. At what date was that?—She was the Commodore ship; the boatswain was sick, and the gunner was called upon to inflict corporal punishment, There was another instance in the West Indies, in the “Hornet.”

3162. (*Chairman.*) Are you aware that it has always been the practice of the service for the boatswain to be liable to be called upon to inflict corporal punishment if required?—I have been a whole commission in a ship and have never seen a boatswain do it. In other instances I have seen the boatswain frequently called upon to do it.

3163. Are you not aware that there is some necessity, and some public advantage also, in the boatswain being liable to be called upon to inflict corporal punishment?—I see none, only in a case of mutiny.

3164. I need not state that it is a disagreeable and a painful duty to inflict corporal punishment upon a man?—Yes.

3165. Do you not, therefore, think that the advantage which the public service derives from the power to call upon the boatswain to set the example of inflicting a necessary punishment is important to the public service?—My own opinion is, and I also state the opinion in general, that such infliction of corporal punishment would be more in accordance with the police duties.

3166. On whom would you wish that this unpleasant duty should fall?—The master-at-arms and the ship's corporal,

3167. You would transfer the duty of inflicting corporal punishment from the hands of the boatswain and his crew to the hands of the master-at-arms and his crew?—Yes. It is disagreeable in either case, and it was the very objection on which I declined accepting a boatswain's mates rating, because I should not be called upon to punish a man.

3168. Might not the master-at-arms and ship's corporal refuse to take their place, because they did not choose to inflict punishment on a man?—On those grounds they may, but if the particular duty was stated that corporal punishment was to be inflicted by the police, they would know it to be their particular duty when they accepted the situation, and they would have an opportunity to accept or refuse it.

3169. Upon the same ground it has always been the practice of the service that the boatswain and his crew should inflict corporal punishment?—If a man becomes an officer I think that duty should cease, and it might still continue with the boatswain's mates.

3170. What position would a ship be in, if, in reference to corporal punishment, the boatswain's mates all refused to inflict it?—I should think the ship would be in a state of mutiny, and then the boatswain would be called upon, or any other officer in a ship, to defend the officers of the ship, as in the case of a mutiny.

3171. You consider that in such a case the boatswain might be fairly called upon to use the cat?—I should think he would be doing his duty to act for the benefit of the Crown, under any circumstances.

3172. You object to be the leader in the punishment, although you do not object to the use of the cat-o'-nine-tails in any case of emergency?—

That, I think, is the clearest manner in which I could answer the question.

3173. I presume you are of opinion that when that grave punishment is inflicted, it is necessary for the sake of the punishment itself, and for the purpose of reducing the punishments in the ship, that that punishment should not be played with?—Yes.

3174. And that it should be in itself severe to the extent that is permitted?—Yes.

3175. Are you not aware, at the same time, that frequently on board a man-of-war the boatswain's mates endeavour, and ingeniously succeed very often, in inflicting very slight punishments, while they are pretending to inflict very severe ones?—Yes, I have seen that; and I have seen men disrated for the same, and I have seen some only reprimanded.

3176. Is there not sometimes a difficulty, when the boatswain himself comes in as a valuable support to the discipline, by being called upon to perform that duty;—There is at the present time, where petty officers and boatswain's mates particularly mess with the ship's company, and which I think would not be the case if the petty officers messed separately, they would not be so familiar with the men whom they would have to punish. It is a very unpleasant thing for a man to punish his messmate, and if he could do it lightly he would do it.

3177. Are you not of opinion that every man, let him be who he may, would naturally shrink from performing such a duty?—It has seldom or ever been my lot to witness any other; in one or two instances I have seen men, who have been blackguards, boast of it, but invariably, as a rule, I think every one would shrink from it.

3178. If you succeeded in throwing that duty off your own shoulders, do not you think that the example would induce others to throw it off also?—They would have similar grounds.

3179. Do you really think, to repeat the words of your memorial, that the being called upon to perform a public duty of that description degrades the character of your office?—I do.

3180. Are you aware that every gentleman, if he be a high sheriff of a county, is compelled by law to put a rope round a man's neck who is sentenced to be hung, if he cannot, out of his own pocket, find a substitute?—I was not aware that the laws of our land ran to such an extent, but having heard your lordship's statement I take it for granted that such is the case.

3181. And it would not be thought by the public any disgrace to that sheriff, if, unable to find a substitute, he fulfilled the duties of his office?—No.

3182. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) Do you know whether, in history, there is an instance of any sheriff having been put into that painful position?—I am not able to answer that question.

3183. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) You would be satisfied if boatswains were never called upon to punish men, unless in cases of mutiny, when no boatswain's mate or man from the ship's company could be induced to do so?—I think then that there would be no boatswain in the service that would hang back; none who, from the position which he held, but what would do it, and if there was any pleasure in it he would consider it to be at that particular time.

3184. Suppose the Lords of the Admiralty issued a circular, to the effect that the boatswain should not be called upon to inflict corporal

punishment, unless in cases of mutiny, would you be satisfied?—I think so.

3185. You are favourable to the petty officers messing together?—Very much so.

3186. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) The master-at-arms and ship's corporal are the police of the ship?—Yes.

3187. If I understand you rightly, your suggestion is that the infliction of punishment should devolve upon them rather than upon the boatswain and the boatswain's mates?—I think it would be more in keeping with their calling.

3188. The one party being the police of the ship, and being generally men who are not on terms of familiarity with the ship's company, and the other party being men who rise from the mass of the ship's company, and between whom and themselves there is, in point of fact, a fellow feeling?—Yes.

3189. There is nothing in the boatswain's duties, unless it were for old-established custom and tradition, which should make him the officer always to be called upon to inflict punishment?—No; but from the boatswains' mates becoming boatswains, they are called upon to take the lead.

3190. There is nothing in the boatswain's duty apart from old usage in the service to make him the officer to be selected for that purpose in preference to any other?—No.

3191. (*Chairman.*) Do you know who performs that painful duty in the army?—The drum-major and the drummers.

3192. There, then, it is not the police of the regiment that perform that duty?—The police, I believe, as far as I have a knowledge of the army, are the non-commissioned officers, viz., sergeants and corporals.

3193. (*Mr. Green.*) Are the ships in the navy ever paid off all standing?—Sometimes; not frequently.

3194. Who dismantles them?—Sometimes labourers and a few riggers from the yard; at other times men from the ordinary, or as they are now called the steam reserve.

3195. Would it not be desirable, in all cases, to pay the ships off all standing as soon as they arrived at Spithead?—From what I have witnessed, in the general method or way in which ships are paid off, I think it would be advantageous to the country at large, and particularly to the seamen themselves.

3196. Is there not, generally, great destruction of property in dismantling by the ship's company?—To such an extent that you are hardly able to avoid it, because the officer cannot detect it, he only sees that the articles are destroyed; he does not know who are the destroyers.

3197. There is loss of life sometimes, is there not?—There has been frequent loss of life from various causes in stripping ships.

3198. Is it the fact that when a ship is paid off only a certain number of Jews, bumboat people, tailors and shoemakers are allowed on board, and that the relatives and friends of the ship's company are kept off in boats alongside?—They have invariably a preference, and very frequently the bumboat people, and the Jews or tradesmen are allowed to come in, and not the relatives and friends of the seamen, and if they are, the tradesmen and bumboat people are there the whole day, and the relatives and friends only at certain times.

3199. I conclude, therefore, that the seamen have ample opportunity

for spending a good portion of their money before they leave the ship?—Yes.

3200. Can a man leave the ship immediately after he is paid, or must he remain on board until all are paid?—Since the ships have been paid alongside the dockyards they invariably go out of the yard as they are paid; when paid afloat they are sometimes kept, that is, the first man is kept till the last is paid.

3201. To remedy this evil, is it not desirable to pay all the ships at the pay office of the dockyard?—Yes, where convenient.

3202. I believe at Woolwich this mode is always adopted?—Within the last ten years it has been.

3203. Are there any savings' banks in connexion with the naval service?—None that I am aware of, although I have heard letters or circulars read, saying, that men may transmit their wages, or remit their surplus to the savings' banks. I am not aware of any having done so.

3204. A seaman has no means of remitting any portion of his wages to his friends through the pay office?—They can at the expiration of every six months.

3205. Not at the pay office?—I have heard a letter or a circular read to that effect, but I do not know that it was ever carried out.

3206. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) Is the option given to them at the pay table of remitting any part of their money to their friends?—Yes, or the whole of it.

3207. (*Mr. Green.*) Do you think if a seaman had £20 or £30 invested in the savings' banks it would deter him from entering into foreign service by having as it were a stake in his own country?—I should think that any man who would be so provident as to save £20 or £30, and to put it by in any savings' bank, it would tend to show the man's providence and carefulness, and that he was a lover of his country, and it would have a tendency to bind him to it.

3208. And naturally prevent his desertion?—Yes. I have heard many men say, "I cannot run away; the ship has been eighteen months in commission, I have so much coming to me, I will run the risk of the rest of the time."

3209. Did you visit the "Niagara," the American frigate, when that ship was over here?—Yes.

3210. Do you know what portion of that ship's crew and marines were composed of British subjects?—Yes; the boatswain stated, he being a native of Gosport, and a deserter from the British navy, that three-fourths of the seamen were English, Irish, and Scotch, and nearly all the marines were Irish.

3211. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) How many men from the "Excellent" were on board?—Some; I cannot say how many.

3212. (*Mr. Green.*) Is it your opinion that the fact of a seaman having money at his command prevents his going to sea, or is he soon tired of the shore and anxious to get afloat?—If a single man he generally likes, indeed invariably, to have what he calls his run out; there are some men who are more careful, and put their money by, and every time they come home they deposit some of their pay in the savings' banks. If they are married, they endeavour to secure a house to themselves, and if they have no families, their wives go into service to enable them to do so, in order that they may live rent free when pensioned off.

3213. Do you consider that the continuous service system is popular among the seamen?—It is not generally popular among the seamen, and it is a great hindrance to the service, and a great drawback to the Crown generally, from the way in which the present continuous service warrant is in force.

3214. Do you consider that the scale of victualling now adopted is ample, and that the men are quite contented with it?—They are not.

3215. What do you think is deficient?—The bread particularly. I have never considered, and I do not think that any man in the service considers, that one pound of biscuit is sufficient, with fresh provisions in particular.

3216. Do you think that a ship would be more readily manned, if not commissioned until ready for sea?—That would depend entirely upon the reserve of seaman that we had.

3217. If seamen were to be found, do you think they would more easily join here?—It would be advantageous to the country and to the seamen to go on board, and sail in a week or ten days after she was commissioned. There is nothing that the seamen dislikes so much as what they call a ship on the home station, and it is attended with immense expense.

3218. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) You have stated that the bumboat people and Jews are admitted into the ship, whilst the friends and relations of the men are kept lying alongside?—Frequently.

3219. Is not that done at the request of and for the convenience of the ship's company themselves?—I think not generally; I have known petty officers go, on behalf of the ship's company, and request that their friends might be allowed to come on board, but because one person had been detected bringing in liquor all were kept out.

3220. (*Mr. Green.*) Did you ever know an instance of a man trying to throw some money into a boat where his friends were, that has fallen overboard?—Yes.

3221. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Do officers not allow the Jews and the bumboat women to come in, for the convenience of the ship's company, at the request of the petty officers?—Invariably.

3222. Then are not the friends of the men kept waiting alongside because, just at that moment, if the whole of them were allowed to come in at once, they would interfere with the duties of the ship?—It may be the case, and I believe it is, in some instances, but not as a general rule.

3223. But at the time the Jews and the bumboat women are admitted alongside the ship, she is being paid off?—Paid in advance; that is the principal time.

3224. The seaman up to that time have had an opportunity of seeing their friends, but on that particular day they cannot see them?—No; they can, paying off. The bumboat people are admitted the whole day, when the friends can only have half an hour or an hour.

3225. But the men have seen their friends up to that time, and are only separated from their friends during a few hours on that day?—Yes; I have seen ships paid in advance, when the men have not had an opportunity of seeing their relatives, and they have sent money ashore by their pretended friends, and their wives have never received it.

3226. You have spoken unfavourably of continuous service; how does it work, badly?—We take men, not knowing what characters they are; they have never been in the service, and they are taken on for ten years. We

find, before they have been six months on board, they are anything but what we wish them to be ; but they keep their characters, sufficiently so as not to be called a bad character, and to be discharged with disgrace. But they never make seamen, and they are an incubus upon the service, and they are a burthen to the ship's company and to the commanding officer ; in fact, the good men have to do their duty for the ten years they are in the service. That is one part of it.

3227. Might not bad men also be entered for short service?—Yes, not exceeding twelve months.

3228. Then, as far as you have gone, your only objection to continuous service is, that bad men are entered for it ;—That is one objection.

3229. If bad men were not entered for it, you would not object to the continuous service?—No, not for good men ; but taking into account the time at which we take them, beginning with the boys first at 14, until they are 28 years of age, which is, I think, too long an engagement. If we took boys from 14 to 19, that would be five years ; and it would be proved, during that time, whether the boys had those abilities which would be all we could expect in the navy, and they make the best seamen in the navy. I believe that we must trust to our navy for self-supply, and the best we can find for it are the boys that enter the service at 14. If they are engaged for five years, they have five years' good training, and during that time you find whether they are fit to be retained in the service, or discharged at the expiration of that time. If you take them for seven years when they have two years' additional training, from nineteen to twenty-one, they would be much better qualified to go into the world. A boy would have had two years' superior training better than his former five years, to establish him as a man, for any part of the world, and if he has got seven years to continue after that, and his treatment has not been good or he has not been rated according to his abilities, he will desert on the first opportunity ; and that, I believe, will be found to have increased the number of desertions since the continuous service warrant came into force. If he had been taken on for five years at eighteen he would have been four years in the service, and if he was worthy of being kept in the service you would rate him as an ordinary seaman, and as soon after an A.B. as he was qualified. If at the expiration of five years he liked the service you could enter him then for continuous service for ten years, from that date, giving him an increased pay for his continuous service ; and if a second ten years' engagement, a second increase of pay, then his time would be up for a pension, and if he did not like to join the service he would leave it ; but if at the age of nineteen he found he was properly treated, and that there was something to aspire to, and he was a lad of more than ordinary talents, or something very superior, he might be placed as an encouragement to the navy, and as something to look forward to, under the tuition of the naval instructor, for the next two years in his watch below, having the same privileges as the young gentlemen of the ship, and, at the age of twenty-one, he might be permitted to pass his examination at the college for a second master or a mate, if qualified, and such number should be in a proportion of one-fourth or one-sixth of the officers of the navy, or any number that their lordships may deem worthy. In order to stimulate the young men in the service, they might be placed on the quarter-deck, and granted £100 for an outfit, the same as a non-com-

missioned officer in the army when he attains his commission. There would then be something for every man to aspire to—something to attach him to the service, and he would not be so ready to enter the merchant service, or into foreign navies for higher wages. Others that do not aspire so high, would aspire to warrant officers. If the warrant officers were in a proper position, so that they could command respect, and were paid for their responsibility, and were allowed to retire at a certain time with a pension for their widows, there would be an opening for every man in the service to become either commissioned or warrant officers, and that would give a stimulus and bind the men in the navy to the service, and it might be suggested that each petty officer, on becoming a warrant officer, should be granted £50 for an outfit.

3230. Are you aware that we entered, at one time, boys for seven years?—Yes.

3231. And that at the expiration of that time they almost invariably left us, having become seamen, and went into the merchant service, where they got higher wages?—Yes.

3232. Then we educated men entirely for the merchant service?—Yes.

3233. Are you also aware that the reason for continuing them on to twenty-eight was, that, after having been at the trouble and expense of educating them, we might have a claim to their services for another seven or eight years?—Yes.

3234. What you object to, is not to continuous service, but to the bad men who get into the service upon the continuous service system, and to their being continued in the service afterwards, that is to say, you think there is an obligation on the part of the Government to retain those men from fourteen to twenty-eight, whatever their characters may be?—If not sufficiently bad to be discharged with disgrace.

3235. Are you aware that whenever a ship comes to England now, the captain of that ship receives an order to pick out of his ship's company all unpromising men, and report their names through the Commander-in-chief to the Admiralty, and that a certain number of officers go on board to examine strictly into the case, and to see whether the representations of the captain are correct, and if so, that those men are discharged from the service?—In some instances I have known that done.

3236. Then, if that were the case, you would not object to continuous service?—If there was a modification of the present rule as to continuous service; that is to say, the time, taking on from fourteen to nineteen, and when it came to that, again taking on for ten years from that date, I think it would wonderfully improve the condition of the navy, and there would be fewer desertions.

3237. Should it be obligatory on a boy to enter again at nineteen, if the Government required it?—Yes.

3238. Is not that the same thing as retaining him till he is twenty-eight, and having the power to discharge him if he is not promising?—For a lad at that age, in order to stimulate him, if there was an increase of pay for every re-entry, there would be something to bind him to the service.

3239. That has nothing to do with the continuous service, as that would be the case in any service, short or long; but short service men do not enjoy that privilege?—The whole of the navy might be brought under the continuous service warrant if the stages or entries were for different periods; if, instead of fourteen years, it was first five years and then ten years from that date.

3240. That is your idea of how the continuous service system might be improved?—Yes.

3241. (*Mr. Cardwell*,) What I understood you to say was, that a boy, having attained the age at which he is fit to be rated as an able seaman, should have the option of becoming a ten years' man, if he thinks proper, but the pay and the prospect of promotion in the service should be such as to induce the clever boys as well as the less aspiring boys to take to the service from choice?—Yes.

3242. (*Sir J. Elphinstone*.) Take the case of a ship fitting out, a great many men join the ship when she is first commissioned, short of clothes?—Very short indeed.

3243. In point of fact they are vagabonds?—Too many of them.

3244. No advance can be made to these men because they would probably run away?—Yes.

3245. And they suffer, do they not, very great hardships while the ship is fitting out, from the want of clothes in going backwards and forwards to the hulk?—Yes; particularly by getting wet, and then getting into the doctor's list.

3246. And they are bad bargains for the rest of the commission?—Yes.

3247. Would you approve of giving to those men a suit of clothes, when they first join the ship of a uniform description, so that they might be identified, and that the service might not suffer by the loss of the clothes?—I have always been of that opinion, that it would tend much to improve the condition of the seamen and prevent their taking up the clothes and selling them. I think that a kit should be given to a man on entering the service of the same value as that which is given to the soldier.

3248. That would be money in addition to his pay, if he got the clothes for nothing?—Yes.

3249. Do you think that, if the Commissioners recommended that suitable clothing should be given to a man on entering the service he paying for the same, or partly paying for the same, by instalments, spread over a certain period of his service, so as to make it probably 15s. or a pound a year, out of the able seaman's wages, that that would be acceptable?—I think it would be a very great improvement. The seamen coming at present from the merchant service, or men coming from the country come in a very destitute state. I have been employed for the last three years at the rendezvous to enter men for the "Excellent," and for the navy generally. I have seen many instances of that, and these are characters generally who get what slops they can, and if possible an advance, and then they desert, and they prevent at the same time the good men in the ship from having their allotments made out, as they cannot be made out universally, and this leaves the wives and families of our seamen in great destitution, because all have to suffer, the good man has to suffer for these sort of men; who come as strangers into the service, and sometimes from the merchant service, and I think that if these men had a suit of clothes or a sufficient supply of clothes, either freely given to them, or given in part, and allow the men who were continuous service men in particular, or men who were non-continuous service men, but had been in the service for some time, that their allotments should continue in force, so that their wives and families might not be left destitute, it would tend to improve their condition more than anything. I know everything that relates to

the seamen's wives, and I see them for five or six months together in total distress, and seeking relief from the parish, although their husbands are in the service they cannot get their allotments.

3250. Do you think that a more effective police would operate to prevent desertion, and the stealing of clothes, and in fact make it a safe thing to the Government to give such advantages as are pointed out?—I think the present system of police is very defective throughout.

3251. With regard to the allowance of bread, is it the case that the allowance of bread is deficient, and that the men have not enough to eat?—A man has not enough when on fresh beef particularly.

3252. The bread is issued twice a week, is it not?—Different ships have different regulations. I have been one of the petty officers who have asked as a favor to have the bread issued daily instead of twice or three times a week, and I have seen three days bread consumed in one day and a half, and the men have been without bread for one day and a half.

3253. You have been in China?—Yes, in the "Pylades."

3254. Did you find the meat and bread upon that station deteriorate and lose its nutritious qualities after a certain time?—Very much so.

3255. Do you think that that affected the health of the ship's company in any degree?—I can speak personally. I was for seven months and never had a bit of bread or beef within my lips owing to their bad quality.

3256. How old were those provisions?—That I cannot state; the meat was what they called country cured meat; cured in India.

3257. Cured in Bengal?—Yes.

3258. Does not the meat even when it is of good quality, frequently shrink, so that a man has not a sufficient quantity to sustain him in health?—Yes.

3259. To what extent does the salt meat shrink in boiling?—I have seen a 4lbs. piece of beef weigh 1lb. 2oz. after it was boiled.

3260. What is the longest period during which the men fast in the 24 hours?—In some ships they pipe to breakfast very early. The invariable rule, when a squadron or a fleet are together, is six or seven bells, seven o'clock or half-past seven; but I have seen them pipe to breakfast at four o'clock in the morning, and if there was no bread in the mess, the men had a basin of tea the night before and no bread. They have a basin of cocoa the next morning with no bread, and a man would have to go then till twelve o'clock.

3261. Then he has a certain quantity of beef shrunk down to whatever it may be boiled to?—Yes. There is an order from the Admiralty, that when the beef shrinks down under a certain weight, the men shall have it weighed over again, and have an increased proportion. There is an improvement in that when it shrinks in weight, I think to one half.

3262. From dinner-time until breakfast the next morning what meals intervene?—None, but what they call supper or tea-time, and if there is any bread in the bag, he gets his bread and tea now. There used to be half an allowance of grog, which is discontinued. He has his tea and biscuit, and he goes from that time till the next morning, till seven or half-past seven.

3263. Have you heard the men complain of weakness from these very long fasts?—I have heard very frequent murmurings, and speaking personally, I have felt very great inconvenience, and I dare say others have felt the same.

3264. In a hot climate, do you attribute any of the sickness which frequently prevails, to the want of food in the morning, to the insufficiency of food during the twenty-four hours, or to the improper division of the food. Has it affected your own health?—Yes: when I have been a long time on boat service or anything of that sort, I have not had my meals at the regular time, or I have missed one meal, being on watch or rowing guard, my appetite has gone, and I have not been able to take food.

3265. An officer has invariably a cup of coffee and a bit of something at daylight in the morning?—If he can get it.

3266. (*Chairman.*) You have stated, that in China you served in a ship where they piped to breakfast always at 4 o'clock; that the men had nothing to eat from 4 till 12; that they had at 4 o'clock their tea or supper, and that an interval elapsed between that time till 4 o'clock next morning, during which time they had nothing to eat. Will you have the goodness to state to the Commissioners whether the provisions that are served out to a ship's company, particularly the bread, tea, and sugar, and some other minor provisions, are not in the hands of the seamen who can help themselves to them when they please?—The bread, tea, and sugar, my lord, are invariably in the hands of the seamen.

3267. Then I apprehend that the seamen could have gone and put their hands into the bread bag, and have helped themselves to some food during those intervals?—If they had any there.

3268. If they had not any there, do not you suppose that the reason why they had not any there was, that many of them had helped themselves in the interval?—With a new ship's company, I know that it is a very frequent practice for young hands to put their hands in the bread bag, but it is not so with old, experienced men-of-war's men.

3269. Will you tell the Commissioners how much money was paid in that ship for provisions saved during any one year, or any six months of the time you were on board?—I am not aware of any amount. That is quite out of my line, the savings of provisions. It is quite foreign from my calling, I know there are savings which arise from various causes, not from a superfluous quantity of provisions, but because it is so bad that it cannot be eaten; and at other times the men put down a certain portion of their monthly money to buy vegetables and other things to take to sea, as a sea stock. I have never known a quantity of bread left behind when on fresh provisions.

3270. Did you ever know money paid to the ship's company for savings?—Frequently.

3271. What was the name of the ship that you have been alluding to, with reference to the diet, and that piped to breakfast at four o'clock in the morning, with not sufficient provisions?—I hope your lordship will understand me. I did not say that it was always, but frequently the case to pipe to breakfast at four o'clock.

3272. I must know the name of the ship where the ship's company was piped to breakfast at four o'clock in the morning, and where the men were long intervals without food?—I think your lordship will recollect that I stated it was not the general rule of the service, that it was the custom of captains and commanders to pipe to breakfast, when apart from a fleet or a squadron, at their own discretion.

3273. I beg that you will give the name of the ship?—At the time I alluded to principally it was in the "Pylades."

3274. Do you mean to assert that in that ship no money was paid to the ship's company for savings?—I do not mean to say any such thing.

3275. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) What you meant to say was that the provisions were short, or the mode of living inconvenient and unsatisfactory, yet that there had been occasions when you yourself had been a sufferer from the want of adequate provisions?—As an officer and a gunner in the "Pylades," for four years, or very nearly, in the China war; the bread for one particular season, namely, seven months, and the salt provisions were so bad, I never put one bit into my lips.

3276. Do you mean to say that upon that particular occasion the other men found the same objection to the food as you did, or were you, from bad health an exception?—My health was very much impaired during that time, and my principal food was tea, sugar candy, and rice.

3277. Do you mean to say that the objection to the bread and meat was so strong that it affected the crew generally, or only persons like yourself in infirm health?—The beef and the bread were very bad, and the crew generally found them so.

3278. Then do you mean to say that the inconvenience felt in the service occurs occasionally on particular stations, when the meat and bread turn out bad, or that the general supply of provisions in the navy is inadequate?—The provisions issued in the navy now are much better than they were at that date; they are not so old, and I think that as to the provisions generally, there is no fault found about the quality of them, and I am not aware that there is as to the quantity, except at the present time as to the bread; the bread is not considered sufficient.

3279. With regard to the meat, we may take it that the allowance is sufficient, and, generally speaking, that the quality is good?—Invariably.

3280. You think that a larger allowance of bread is requisite?—I do.

3281. Does that apply to all stations, and all times, or does it apply particularly to cold stations, and to any other special circumstances to which you can direct our attention?—Invariably men will eat more in cold weather than in warm; young hands will eat more than a man-of-war's man; the fresh meat will always require more bread than the salt provisions, because you have on one occasion peas, and on another flour, which more than counterbalances the small supply of vegetables that you get. With the pork we have peas, with the beef flour.

3282. Are you prepared to say that, except the bread, the allowance of provisions is adequate in quantity and satisfactory in quality, and that you wish the commissioners to recommend a general increase in the quantity of bread?—Yes.

3283. What general increase would you wish us to recommend?—At all times, when on fresh provisions, the bread should be $1\frac{1}{2}$ lb.; when on salt provisions, there are different opinions upon that. I think that 1 lb. is sufficient when on salt provisions, for on one occasion you have flour, and on another peas.

3284. (*Mr. Green.*) If there was no limit to the allowance of bread, would it be wasted on board a man-of-war?—I do not think it would be wasted more there than in the merchant service. I have been in the merchant service, and I have never seen it wasted, and whenever we came on board, we could go and eat as much as we liked, but we wasted none. I have found that there was less consumed, when it was so issued. I have known

men take it up, if they have been at variance with the steward; they would take it up and get rid of it under any circumstances, but not waste it.

3285. (*Chairman.*) Are you of opinion that a seaman, instead of receiving payment for a ration that he did not consume, would be better satisfied with the power to take what he liked, under the regulation of the police, but to receive no remuneration whatever in money?—I do not think he would. The payment for the savings of provisions enables the seamen when in port to have a change, that is they can get soft bread or other provisions, such as fresh meat. If they had, no change, and there was no payment for the savings, they would be always confined to one diet, and it would take a portion of their pay to provide a change, and that would lessen their income.

3286. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Is it not your opinion that upon many occasions the shrinkage in salt beef is not sufficiently made up to the ship's company?—I am of that opinion.

3287. Then you would recommend that the shrinkage should be made up in a more liberal way than it is now?—It would improve the scheme of victualling for the navy, and I believe the seamen would be better satisfied.

3288. You are for the seaman having his pound of beef and not less from the coppers?—Yes, I am.

3289. What is your opinion of the position and treatment of the seamen in Her Majesty's service in the present day? Have they any grievances, and if they have, state them?—The treatment of seamen generally has wonderfully improved within the last few years, in every ship almost, with some few exceptions. The good conduct warrant is a general source of grievance and murmuring to the seamen now. A petty officer who has been fifteen years a petty officer gets nothing for his stripes, if he gets them after he has got the badge, whereas a man who has been fifteen years an able seaman, and is then made a petty officer, gets 3d. a day more than a man who has been fifteen years a petty officer; there is no increase of pay for increased service, after the first entry, but for an able seaman just entered, or an ordinary seaman just rated A.B., and one who has been ten years or fifteen years, the pay is the same, and I think that there should be something after the second or the third entry to induce them to remain in the service, and to show that they are worth more to the country after ten or fifteen years' experience than a man who has just entered. There is another grievance that is complained of, and it is a too frequent one, namely, that one man is punished for another one's faults. If one man breaks his leave, perhaps the whole watch is stopped; if a man gets drunk, the whole mess may be punished. These things differ in the punishment, and the mode of punishment, under different captains and commanding officers. I have also stated that I thought the police of the ship was imperfect in order to avoid drunkenness or traffic in grog between decks, which is the foundation of the principal part of the punishments in a man-of-war. When a man leaves his spirits behind, he leaves sixteen days' allowance for 9d., that is, if he gets it from the paymaster. If he takes the spirits up, he will always find people ready to buy it, and to give him 3d. for his half-gill, and he will therefore receive 4s. instead of 9d. This induces men to take up their spirits, and to traffic or trade in it with those inclined to drink it, whereas if the men were paid the full value of the spirits, it would be left behind instead of being sold to the men to get drunk with between

decks. I know there has been an objection to that, because Government get it duty-free, but this is a thing which I have witnessed. I speak facts not advising any one to act upon them, but only as a suggestion. The method of drill is in some cases very harassing, experienced seamen being drilled with inexperienced men, and too frequently drilling seamen against time, instead of teaching them how to do the work. Continuous service men feel that they have been broken faith with, in their allotments not being kept in force, while remaining in the service. Again seamen invariably like to choose their own ship, some men always prefer a small ship, and others a large one; they also like to choose their own captain, and if good men are forced into a ship against their will with a lot of bad men, there is always discontent and division between the ship's company. Medals and gratuities are not granted to men, that is, as a general rule, unless a ship is paid off. A man serves in the service for twenty-one years, and takes up his pension, and because the ship is not paid off, he cannot be recommended for a medal, or a gratuity, and he loses £10 or £15 as a gratuity and a medal, and the advantage of £4 10s. a year pension which is given to 1 per cent. or 1 in every 100, and sometimes there are ten men whom the captain would like to recommend, all the ten men are equally deserving, but only perhaps two out of the ten get it.

3290. And they lose their chance?—Yes, they do, if they do not serve again, and have not some captain to recommend them, on being paid off, they do not get it. They have the same risk to run as before. There is another point, the gunners in the *Excellent* number from thirty to sixty, and sometimes more, but thirty-five is the average, speaking of the gunners' mess, they have to form their mess and to keep themselves respectable at all times, to perform the principal duties of the ship, and be ready to be sent to sea at an hour's notice. They have nothing to form a mess, no increased pay, they are on harbour pay, the only class in the ship not on sea pay. They are also on a reduced scale for retirement. What I have stated, I have said, I trust, from a love of my country and of the service generally, and if I have made any statement that has not met the views of the Commission, I trust they will pardon me, I have done it from a pure love of my country, and for the good of the service I belong to.

3291. (*Chairman.*) Will you have the goodness to state to the Commissioners the names of the ships which you have served in in the navy?—"The Prince," "The Favourite," "Excellent," "Rodney," "Cornwallis," "Excellent," "Malabar," "Cornwallis," "Excellent," "Pylades," "Amazon," "Fisgard," "Sans Pareil," "Excellent."

3292 The "Excellent" was, I believe, the gunnery ship in Portsmouth Harbour?—Since 1833.

3293. You never served in her otherwise?—No.

3294. The "Fisgard," is an ordinary ship?—When I was in her I was borne as an additional gunner to train the dock-yard battalions.

3295. What ships can you distinguish from the rest as ships in active service?—All the remainder were active ships.

3296. The opinions which you have formed of the service have been not unnaturally formed in the ships you have served in?—I have formed them, my Lord, from personal experience.

3297. Your personal experience has been gained with the officers with whom you have served?—Yes.

3298. You have stated that one of the grievances is, that one man is liable to be punished for another. I should very much like to know whether that is your idea of the general conduct of the captains of ships, in reference to the management of their crews?—Some captains are quite the reverse and leave every man to bear his own burden, and are particularly desirous of sifting out a matter, in order that no man should be punished unjustly.

3299. Your next grievance is, that men are punished for being drunk, and in that case the whole mess is very often punished for one man?—Yes.

3300. Is it not the practice of the seamen to appoint a man under the title of cook of the mess, who keeps the mess kits clean, the mode of remunerating him being by giving him the surplus of their grog daily?—In some ships it is so.

3301. Is it not, as far as you know, and have heard, the general practice of the seamen in the service to do it where they can?—No. I have been in messes where we would not have that, and every man has taken his regular allowance of grog.

3302. Where it is done, that in itself would produce a drunken man in every mess in the ship once a day?—If they did it to that extent that the men's spirits were so reduced as to give the surplus quantity to the cook, it would be so.

3303. Would it be wrong to punish the mess for the drunkenness of the one man in that case?—One man cannot lead twenty.

3304. But the mess has originated a system whereby they make one man drunk daily. Is there any impropriety in such a case, in punishing the mess for that one man's drunkenness?—That is a question that I am not prepared to answer.

3305. In such a case is not the punishment mild when it is inflicted?—The caterer of the mess is generally the greatest sufferer, although he may know no more about it than the greatest stranger, and the drunken man may not have drawn the spirits upon which he got drunk from his mess. The caterer of the mess is called upon to give an account, and he cannot do it; and sometimes he forfeits his conduct badge, and sometimes his petty officers' badge, in consequence of the man being drunk.

3306. You refer also to another grievance, namely, the harassing drill that takes place on board of ship. I apprehend that that would fall very fairly in your own mind upon particular individuals, and not upon the whole service?—Not upon the whole service.

3307. You also state that you very much object to "drilling against time" without instructing the men?—Yes.

3308. I apprehend that every man would agree with you in that opinion?—If the men were taught to do their work first, quickness would follow; but if they try to make the men do it quickly, before they have learnt how to do it properly, as a practical officer your lordship knows what the result would be.

The witness withdrew.

Cambridge Terrace, Lake Lane,
Portsea, January 7, 1859.

SIR,

The deputation of the Gunners, Boatswains, and Carpenters of the Royal Navy, beg leave to return their sincere thanks to the Royal Commission for Manning the Navy, for the patient investigation granted them to corroborate the statements contained in their memorial; and furthermore, with a view to assist the Commissioners in their deliberations, do, in accordance with your letter of the 29th ult., humbly lay before them the enclosed documents, trusting they may not in the least be considered as dictating to the Royal Commission, only endeavouring to show in a plain statement the contrast between the navy and army, with a few suggestions, praying the consideration of the Commissioners.

We are, &c.,

The DEPUTATION.

THOMAS HOWELS, Gr.
WILLIAM ANDREWS, Gr.
RICHARD SPRY, Gr.
GEORGE LUMB, Gr.
JAMES PIBWORTH, Gr.
JAMES COOPER, Gr.
JOHN T. WALKER, Gr.
JAMES CARDEN, Bn.
WILLIAM SMITH, Bn.
GEORGE WEBBER, Bn.
JOHN DENNISON, Bn.

WILLIAM NICHOLS, Bn.
JOHN GRIGG, Bn.
JAMES UFFIN, Bn.
STEPHEN MOORE, Cr.
JOHN JONES, Cr.
EDWARD STRICKLAND, Cr.
JOSIAH V. EARL, Cr.
WILLIAM CORNISH, Cr.
JONATHAN MAY, Cr.
ROBERT HALL, Cr.

H. C. ROTHERY, Esq.,
Secretary.

Navy.			Army.
<i>Pay per day.</i>			
Able Seaman:—	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	Private:—
Continuous service ...	1	7	Cavalry, 1s. 3d., after 17 years
Non-continuous ditto ...	1	4	Infantry, 1s., after 14 years
2nd Class Petty Officer:—			Corporal:—
Continuous service ...	1	10	Cavalry, 1s. 7½d., after 17 years
Non-continuous ditto ...	1	7	Infantry, 1s. 4d., after 14 years
1st Class Petty Officer:—			Serjeant { Cavalry ..
Continuous service ...	2	0	{ Infantry ..
Non-continuous ditto ...	1	9	Colour-Serjeant, Infantry ..
Chief Petty Officer:—			Quartermaster-Serjeant, Infantry
Continuous service ...	2	3	Serjeant-Major, Cavalry ..
Non-continuous ditto ...	2	0	Serjeant-Major, Infantry .
Query, Might not continuous service men have an increase of pay at their second entry?			
Query, Might not 1st class petty officers be paid equal to serjeants, and chief petty officers as serjeant-majors?			

Navy.	Army.	
<i>Clothing, Annual Value of</i>		
Query, May not clothing of an equal value be granted petty officers and seamen; also boys on entry?	Serjeant of Infantry ..	£ s. d. 7 9 2
	Corporal of Infantry ..	4 19 0
	Private of Infantry ..	2 6 0

Good Conduct Badges.

Seamen and petty officers are paid from one penny to three pence per day only, petty officers are not paid for good-conduct badges received after they become petty officers; this causes much discontent.	Privates and corporals are paid from one penny to sixpence per day, serjeants are not paid for badges, they have had a universal increase of two pence per day added to their pay.
--	--

Annuities.

Petty officers have no annuities. For a short time they were allowed a "short service gratuity," on the ship being paid off, at the rate of one per cent.; that is discontinued. Query, Might not petty officers be granted a similar reward for distinguished or meritorious service?	Formerly £2000 were allowed. But from the 4th June, 1853, £4000 per year is granted in distributing annuities, as rewards for distinguished or meritorious service, to serjeants £20 each, with or without pension, may be held during service, and together with pension.
--	--

Medals and Gratuities.

For long service and good conduct the navy and army are treated alike, but certain restrictions in the navy prevent many men of good conduct from obtaining such rewards when they have served their time, viz., 20 or 21 years.

Pensions.

Query, May not chief petty officers equal serjeant-majors?		s.	d.
Query, 1st class petty officers equal serjeants?	Serjeant-Majors, not to exceed ..	2	6 per day.
Query, 2nd class petty officers equal corporals?	Serjeants not to exceed	2	3
Query, Able seamen, equal privates?	Corporals not to exceed	1	6
	Privates not to exceed	1	3

The non-commissioned officers receiving higher pensions than petty officers, is a cause of much discontent in the navy.

Outfits.

Query, Might not every petty officer obtaining a warrant, receive £50 for an outfit? The average cost of such varies from £60 to £80.	Every non-commissioned officer receiving a commission in a cavalry regiment, receives £150 for an outfit; infantry, £100.
---	---

Relative Rank.

Lieutenants, master of fleet, masters, chaplains, surgeons, and paymasters	} with captains.
Mates and assistant surgeons ..	„ lieutenants.
Second masters and midshipmen ..	„ ensigns.
Gunners, boatswains, carpenters ..	None assigned.
They are storekeepers and executive officers in addition. The carpenter is also a master mechanic.	Quartermasters are storekeepers, and have that duty alone to perform; they rank with subalterns of the same date.

Navy.

Army.

Pay per Day.

Gunners, boatswains, carpenters:—

Sea pay. Harbour pay.

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>		<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1st class	6	7	-	5	7
2nd -	5	8	-	4	4
3rd -	4	9	-	3	6

The above is the *highest* scale of pay, no matter what length of service.

Quartermasters, first appointment:—

Cavalry, 8s. 6d.; infantry, 6s. 6d. per day.

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
10 years as quartermaster, or 15 yrs. as non-commissioned officer & quartermaster, 5 of which as quartermaster.	C. 10	6
	I. 8	6
After 15 years quartermaster or 20 years commissioned or non-commissioned officer, 10 years of which as quartermaster - -	C. 12	0
	I. 10	0

Retirement.

Gunners, Boatswains, Carpenters, have no claim to retire till pronounced 'unfit to serve,' then for every year served at sea as gunner, boatswain, or carpenter, £3 per year is allowed; for every year in harbour, £1 10s.; in addition from £1 to £15 *discretional*.

Example:...For 10 years petty officer and seamen, nothing; 15 years "sea time," £45; 5 years "harbour" time, £7 10s. with £15 added. Total Retirement, £67 10s. per year, equal to 3s. 8d. per day, for an aggregate of 30 years' service.

Quartermasters.

Unqualified claim to retire. Victoria R., 17th December, 1855. Quartermasters who shall have served for an aggregate period of 30 years, 10 of which as quartermaster, shall have a claim to retire with the honorary rank of captain, upon the half-pay of 10s. per day.

Widows' Pensions per annum.

Gunners, Boatswains, Carpenters, warranted subsequent to June, 1830.
If killed in action ... £35
Drowned, or violent death ... 30
Natural death ... none

Quartermasters.			
Under 10 yrs.	After 10 yrs.	Do. 20 yrs.	
£46	£60	£80	
40	50	65	
36	40	50	

Compassionate Allowance.

Do not extend to the children of gunners, boatswains, and carpenters, only to commissioned officers; here they lose much from having no position; they also lose the advantage of various schools for their children.

Quartermasters.

The amount granted varies according to circumstances, viz., from £8 to £16 per year for each child.

Losses by Fire, Wreck, &c.

Gunners, Boatswains, Carpenters.

Entire loss of clothes, bedding, } £30
cabin furniture, &c. ... }

Quartermasters.

Entire loss of clothes, &c. ... £68
Tent, &c. 12

A PROPOSED SCHEME for Improving the Condition of the Royal Navy.

1st. Open the Quarter-deck to Promotion, and to each so promoted grant £100 for an outfit.

2nd. Let the position of Gunners, Boatswains, and Carpenters, be first class, to rank with Masters of the same date; second class with Mates of the same date; third class with Second Masters of the same date. To each Petty Officer warranted, grant £50 for an outfit.

3rd. Gunners to be exempt from charge of decks, main-yard, and rigging.

4th. Grant Warrant Officers (so called) a relative rank in the Army.

5th. Prize money, check money, and pay will depend much upon the position assigned them, it is thought that they may be compared with Quarter-masters of the Army, and paid according to their length of service.

6th. Reduced or "harbour" pay abolished.

7th. Pay of a Boatswain of a Dock-yard and Master Rigger as formerly, viz.: £250 per year.

8th. Widows Pensions; the amount will depend much upon the position granted.—We quote the Quarter-masters of the Army for example.

9th. Retirement might be granted after an aggregate of 30 years' service, increasing the amount as the warranted time increased. Vide Quarter-masters.

10th. Pensions for wounds or hurts in proportion with other grades.

11th. Rewards to the seniors for "War Service" by a "Good Service Pension."

12th. Boatswains to be exempt from inflicting corporal punishment.

13th. Total losses by fire, wreck, &c.; £60 would scarce meet the average amount; £30 only is allowed.

14th. That no Gunner, Boatswain, or Carpenter, be dismissed the Service without Trial by "Courts-Martial."

15th. That any improvement granted might extend to those now in the Service, that they may reap the benefit of their past Services; this would allow old and infirm Officers to retire, and open the door of promotion throughout the Service.

16th. That a copy of all the duties, pay, pension, retirement, &c- be granted each Gunner, Boatswain, and Carpenter, for their future guide.

ATTESTED
Notary Public

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of July, 1900, at the County of _____ State of _____

Notary Public

MANNING THE NAVY.

The following is the Report of the Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the best means of Manning the Navy, just presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty:—

“TO THE QUEEN’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“We, your Majesty’s Commissioners, appointed ‘to inquire into the best means of manning the navy, and in what manner, and under what arrangements, seamen may be readily obtained for such purpose, either during peace or in case of sudden emergency or war,’ and to offer such suggestions as may occur to us ‘for the amendment of the system at present in existence, and the means by which, under the prerogative of the Crown, the fleet was heretofore manned in time of war;’ and especially to report to your Majesty our ‘opinion as to the way in which the valuable services of the seamen of the mercantile marine and the seafaring population of the united kingdom may be rendered more readily and willingly available, when required for your Majesty’s naval service, do most humbly report to your Majesty as follows:—

“1. We have in obedience to your Majesty’s commands, carefully perused the report of the committee of naval officers appointed in the year 1852, to enquire into various subjects relating to the manning of the navy, together with the evidence taken before them, as also your Majesty’s order in Council, dated the 1st of April, 1853, by which the recommendations of that committee were, as far as it was then deemed necessary, carried into effect; and we have called for such papers and returns, and have examined such witnesses, as appeared to us to be likely to afford the best information on the matters referred to us.

“2. The points to which our attention has been directed are:—1. The mode in which your Majesty’s ships are manned in time of peace, the condition of the seamen, and whether any alterations could be introduced by which the service might be rendered more popular; 2. The mode in which the fleet has heretofore been manned in time of war; the means which exist for that purpose; the character and extent of the reserves on which reliances can be placed; what measures it is now desirable to adopt; and the means by which the services of the merchant seamen and the seafaring population of the united kingdom could be rendered more readily available.

“Mode of Manning the Navy in time of Peace.

“3. Prior to the year 1853, the practice during peace was to enter volunteers for particular ships, nominally for five years, but practically for the period during which the ship remained in commission, averaging from three to four years. This system was attended with great inconvenience to the public service and even to the seamen themselves. Men who had been trained at great trouble and expense, and had been brought to a state of the highest efficiency, were suddenly dismissed, and being unable to obtain readmission to the service, often sought employment under a foreign flag, and thus, when required for Your Majesty's ships, were not to be procured. This led not only to great delay in conducting the ordinary duties of the service, but was the source of serious embarrassment, when political considerations rendered necessary the speedy equipment of a fleet.

“Continuous Service System.

“4. With the view of ascertaining whether other arrangements might not be adopted with advantage to the service, and at the same time be the means of improving the condition of the petty officers and seamen of the fleet, a committee of naval officers was appointed in the year 1852, by the Duke of Northumberland, the then First Lord of the Admiralty, to consider ‘the question in all its bearings;’ and, in pursuance of the recommendations of that committee, the continuous service system, by which seamen were induced for certain advantages to engage themselves to serve continuously for a period of 10 years, was introduced into your Majesty's navy.

“5. That system has now been in partial operation between five and six years, and, although it has not been carried out to the full extent contemplated by the committee, it has already been attended with very beneficial results, and has secured to the country a body of well-trained and efficient seamen, whose attachment to the service is the best security for the faithful performance of their duties.

“6. We have the strongest evidence before us that under this system the ordinary peace establishment of the Navy can be maintained by voluntary recruitment at whatever constant force your Majesty and Parliament may determine; and if the recommendations of the committee, to which we are about to advert, were carried into effect, we think that the country would reap the full benefit of the system, and that the peace establishment of the Navy would be placed upon a satisfactory footing.

“Boys.

“7. The committee of 1852, in their report, observed that it was chiefly to the boys that they must look for the gradual organization of a permanent navy. They stated that by official returns it appeared that, during the preceding 12 years, upwards of 2000 boys had upon an average been annually entered, ‘a number which would go far, on the usual peace establishment of the navy for that period, to replace the vacancies caused by deaths, invalidings, pensions, casual discharges, &c.’ And they add, that experience

had taught them, that ‘men, who have been received into the navy as boys become, from early habits and associations, more attached and adhere more closely to the service than those entered at a more advanced age, and that they eventually constitute, from their superior education and training, the most valuable part of the crews of Her Majesty’s ships.’ In this opinion we concur.

“8. At the present time, however, only about 500 of those who annually enter the Navy have the advantage of passing through the training vessels, and so sensible are we of the advantages of early training that we recommend that a large ship, similar to the *Britannia* at Portsmouth, and capable of affording accommodation to 500 boys, should be placed at Plymouth; and that four additional training vessels should be provided, which would enable the whole of the boys required for the navy to receive the same instruction. This would entail an expense of about £15,918 per annum.

“Reserve in the Home Ports.

“9. Another recommendation of the committee of 1852, which has not hitherto been carried into effect, is the maintaining an adequate reserve of seamen in the home ports. They observed that from the information and evidence that had been laid before them ‘during the progress of the inquiry, they had been led to the conclusion that it was desirable to keep a larger force at home than had been customary of late years;’ and they recommended, ‘that your Majesty’s navy should be maintained at such a numerical force in commission as, independently of the Channel squadron, will admit of 10,000 seamen and boys (exclusive of officers) being retained in England for the protection of the ports and the coasts of the united kingdom.

“10. The evidence before us shows that, when a ship of war is commissioned, the most costly part of her complement, namely the officers, and perhaps the greater part of her crew, immediately become a charge upon the State, and continue so for several weeks, and even months, during which she is unable to put to sea for want of the smaller portion of her crew; while the whole expense of the ship which she was intended to relieve is going on.

“11. We are, therefore, of opinion that a reserve of seamen should always be maintained in the home ports, ready to complete the crews of ships put in commission, for the relief of foreign stations, and as the best and most prompt of all reserves in the event of a sudden armament. The number to be thus retained in the home ports should bear a relation to the number in commission; and, with our present peace establishment, we think that it should not be less than 4000, besides those retained in the harbour guard ships. Such an arrangement also would afford a ready means of giving a systematic training in gunnery to all the men in your Majesty’s naval service. We estimate the additional expense of this reserve, after allowing for the economy consequent on the rapidity of the reliefs, at the sum of £132,000.

“Seamen-Gunners.”

“12. And here we beg to call your Majesty’s attention to the extreme importance of encouraging seamen to qualify themselves as seamen-gunners. The committee of 1852 recommended that the number under training in the *Excellent* and her tenders should be increased; they stated that they could not overrate the ‘advantages which the naval service had derived from the systematic instruction and training, both of officers and men, in gunnery and the use of arms, as established on board that ship.’

“13. In this opinion we concur; we believe that seamen, well trained in gunnery, are becoming daily more and more essential, and in order to induce seamen more readily to enter the gunnery ships *Excellent* and *Cambridge*, and to qualify themselves for the highly important situations of seamen-gunners, we recommend that the pay of each class of seamen-gunners be increased to the extent of 1d. a day. With a view, also, of retaining them when once qualified, we recommend that a period of five years’ service as seamen-gunners should count as six years towards a long service pension, and that the pension should be payable to them only in the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands. These measures appear to be rendered necessary by a review of the relative position of this class as compared with the Coastguard and other branches of the service. We think, also, that of the 4000 men retained in the home ports 1000 should always be seamen-gunners. The extra charge on this head would be about £6239 per annum.

“14. These measures are, in our opinion, all that are needed under the foregoing heads to place the peace establishment of the navy on a firm and satisfactory basis, and to secure the complete and efficient working of the continuous service system. Great care should, however, be taken in selecting the men. Looking to the efficiency of the reserves, which we hope to form out of those who have served for 10 years’ continuous service, we think that it is desirable that they should not be above the age of 25 at the time of their admission, and above all that they should be strong and healthy.

“Condition of the Seamen in the Royal Navy.”

“15. Though there is no difficulty under the continuous service system in maintaining the peace establishment of the navy, yet your Majesty’s service is not so popular as it should be with the great body of the mercantile marine. The disinclination to enter the navy in the minds of a large portion of the merchant seamen is to be traced chiefly to ignorance of the usages of the service, and of the advantages which it offers to the seaman, for we find that the better the service is known the more its privileges are appreciated and the greater is the willingness to join it. We have satisfied ourselves that there is no undue severity in your Majesty’s service; on the contrary, the witnesses place a high value on the strict observance of discipline, and consider that crews are exposed to injury and injustice whenever, from weakness in the commander of a ship, discipline is relaxed. At the same time we are of opinion that some arrangements in regard to the condition of the seamen might properly be introduced, which would tend to make the service more popular. These we proceed to indicate to your Majesty.

“The Hulks.

“16. The witnesses complain of the condition of the hulks, in which the men are lodged while their ships are fitting out. They state that the hulks are so uncomfortable that both officers and men have the greatest dislike to them; all desire to escape from them as soon as the day’s work is over, preferring a residence on shore to the great detriment of the infant discipline of the newly raised crew. An experiment has, however, been lately tried at Portsmouth, by the establishment of a model hulk, the *Bellerophon*, which has been attended with great success. We recommend that the attention of the Admiralty be called to this matter, and that improvements be made in the lighting, ventilating, warming, and other internal arrangements of the hulks, upon which the health and comfort of the men so much depend.

“Provisions.

“17. Witnesses of great authority have told us that they consider the allowance of provisions on board your Majesty’s ships to be sufficient; and in proof of that opinion they point to the fact that large payments are frequently made to a ship’s company for savings of provisions. This, however, is not conclusive evidence, for the savings of a ship’s company arise from a variety of causes: first, the provisions, when of indifferent quality, are not taken up, and are consequently paid for as savings; secondly, when a ship is in port the men purchase largely from the shore out of their pay, and in that case do not take up their provisions; and, thirdly, a considerable proportion of the savings is due, not to men, but to the officers, who very generally save the whole, or nearly the whole, of their allowance.

“18. On the other hand, we have the evidence of the men themselves, strongly confirmed by that of several eminent naval officers, that the allowance in your Majesty’s service of both bread and meat, which is only 11b. of each daily, is inadequate. In the Peninsular and Oriental and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Companies’ services the allowance of salt meat is half as much again; and in Mr. Green’s ships, where the allowance of bread is unlimited, nearly a pound and a half of meat is served out daily to each man. We find, also, on comparing a great number of tables of allowance produced to us by the Registrar-General of Seamen, that in the merchant service generally the daily allowance is:—Of salt beef one pound and a half, and of salt pork one pound and a quarter. These tables will be found in the appendix.

“19. On the whole, we are of opinion that the allowance of both bread and salt meat should be increased to one pound and a quarter of each daily. At the same time, as the object of this increase is to give the men a full allowance of food, and not to enable them to receive a larger sum for savings, we think that the rate of payment for them should be diminished, and that instead of 2d. a pound being allowed for bread, and 4d. for salt meat, 1d. only should be allowed for the former and 3d. for the latter. The additional annual charge on account of the increased allowance of bread would be £43,181, and of salt meat £37,040, making together £80,221; against which would have to be placed the diminished payments on account of savings, which we are informed would be £37,890, leaving an increase on the annual estimates under this head of £42,331.

“Clothes, Bedding, and Mess Utensils.”

“20. We understand also that when men enter your Majesty’s service they are furnished with bedding and clothes, the whole value of which is charged against their future pay. They thus incur a debt to the Crown, and until that debt has been satisfied can neither allot nor receive that portion of their pay termed ‘monthly allowance.’ They have also to provide their mess utensils. So that for several months from their first entering the men are in difficulties, and their wives and children too frequently dependent on the parish for support. To enable the men to commence their service free from debt, we recommend that the bedding and mess utensils should be issued, as the hammocks now are; and that to every man on his first entering for 10 years’ continuous service a suit of clothes should be given gratuitously. This would entail an additional charge of £14,200 per annum. Great evil is experienced from the want of the prohibition, which exists in the case of the army, against the purchase of clothes issued to the men. We think that this opportunity should be taken of placing both services on the same footing.

“Payment of Wages while the Ship is Fitting Out.”

“21. The witnesses have also stated that great inconveniences result from the present regulations in regard to the payment of wages while the ship is fitting out. We understand, however, that this subject has recently engaged the attention of the Admiralty; and that, since this Commission has been sitting, arrangements have been under consideration, with the view of enabling the seaman to receive his ‘monthly allowance,’ and to allot a portion of his wages at an earlier period than he now can. We strongly recommend that these arrangements should be carried into effect. We think, however, that as the matter is now under the consideration of the Admiralty, the details of the measures to be taken should be left to their discretion; and we therefore refrain from making any more specific recommendation on the subject.

“Allotments.”

“22. The system of Allotments has been much complained of. Under the Merchant Shipping Act the only persons who can recover as allottees from the owners are the wife, the father or mother, the grandfather or grandmother, the child or grandchild, or the brother or sister of the seaman (17th and 18th Victoria, cap. 104, sec. 169). But in the Royal Navy seamen have the power of allotting to any persons they please, and we have the evidence of those well acquainted with the present practice, that allotments are frequently made by seamen to very undeserving characters, to persons who have no natural claim whatever upon them, while their families are perhaps compelled to resort to the parish for relief. The practice in regard to allotments is perfectly satisfactory to the merchant seamen, and we recommend that it should be adopted in the Royal Navy.

“Badge Money.”

“23. The preceding remarks apply to the seamen of the Royal Navy generally, but there is one subject which affects the petty officers, which we beg to

submit for your Majesty's consideration. Able seaman receive from 1d. to 3d. a day badge money, according to the number of good conduct badges they have earned, and this extra allowance is continued if they are subsequently promoted to be petty officers. But petty officers, becoming entitled to a good conduct badge, receive no extra pay for it. So that a petty officer, who had earned three good conduct badges during the time he was an able seaman might be in the receipt of 3d. a day more than a petty officer having the same character and the same qualifications, who for his good conduct and ability had been promoted to be a petty officer before he had earned any good conduct badges. This, we are of opinion, should be remedied, and the same payment made for good conduct badges whether earned as able seaman or as petty officers. This would require an additional sum of £6,833 per annum.

“Warrant Officers.

“24. The case of the warrant officers has occupied our attention. It is the highest grade to which the seaman ordinarily aspires, and to place this class of officers in the position to which they are entitled will offer an additional inducement to seamen to enter your Majesty's service. We have received from the warrant officers a memorial, which will be found in the appendix.

“25. They complain that the precedence assigned to them on board your Majesty's ships is not such as they ought to hold. Formerly they ranked next after second masters, and since 1844 have been placed below the young and inexperienced cadet, although they are at times required to take charge of a watch, and during the late Russian war frequently had charge of mortar and gun-boats. We recommend that they should rank after second masters.

“26. They likewise complain that their widows have been deprived of the pensions to which they were formerly entitled. There are few more difficult subjects than that of widows' pensions; and, in evidence well worthy of attention, we have been urged rather to recommend that the sum which these pensions would require should be expended in improving the position of the officers themselves. We have no reason, however, to suppose that any general alteration on the subject of widows' pensions is intended; and in the present state of the service we think that the benefits conferred upon the widows of officers in the higher ranks ought not to be withheld from the widows of seamen who have risen by merit through successive stages of promotion to the rank of warrant officers. We think that in fairness this payment should be retrospective. The cost involved is £19,150.

“Promotion of Warrant Officers.

“27. In the circular (No. 121) of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, dated the 14th of June, 1853, it was stated that, ‘as a further mark of their approbation of the merits of this deserving class of officers, my Lords are pleased to direct that warrant officers of exemplary conduct, who have distinguished themselves by acts of gallantry and daring in the service, be considered eligible to hold commissions in Her Majesty's fleet, in such rank or position as their Lordships may deem them, after undergoing

an examination, entitled to receive and competent to fill, and all warrant officers so promoted will be granted respectively the sum of £100 as an outfit.' We anticipate the best results from the occasional promotion of a warrant officer to the quarter deck; at the same time, we are ready to admit that the promotion should only be granted for distinguished service combined with exemplary conduct; and it should not be limited to the warrant officers, but should be open, in the case of very signal and extraordinary services, to any seaman in your Majesty's navy.

"Promotion of Petty Officers.

"28. There is also a point relating to the promotion of petty officers which deserves attention. We have been assured that seamen have occasionally refused the warrant in consequence of the expense necessary to provide a suitable outfit. We think that the principle of giving a gratuity to a warrant officer on his promotion to the quarter-deck is equally applicable to the case of a petty officer promoted to the warrant. But we understand that since our commission was issued this subject has been reviewed by the Board of Admiralty, and £15 assigned by a recent order for this purpose.

"29. Such are the measures which we have ventured to recommend to your Majesty with reference to the mode of manning the navy in time of peace. They appear to us the best that can be devised for improving the condition and raising the character of the seamen in the Royal Navy; and, aided by frequent visits of vessels of war to the different mercantile ports of the United Kingdom, will render the service more popular, and tend to effect the object which we have in view—namely, the speedy and efficient manning of your Majesty's ships.

"Improvements in the Peace Establishment.

1. Increased allowances of provisions	£ 42,331
2. Pensions of warrant officers' widows	19,150
3. Mess utensils, clothes, and bedding	14,200
4. Instruction and training ships	15,918
5. Petty officers' badges	6,833
6. Pay and pensions for gunnery	6,239
			<hr/> 104,671

"Witness our hands and seals this 19th day of February, 1859.

"HARDWICKE.	(L.S.)
"CHANDOS.	(L.S.)
"EDWARD CARDWELL.	(L.S.)
"W. FANSHAWE MARTIN.	(L.S.)
"J. D. H. ELPHINSTONE.	(L.S.)
"JOHN SHEPHERD.	(L.S.)
"RICHARD GREEN.	(L.S.)

"H. C. ROTHERY, Secretary."

P.S.—The remaining part of the Report will not affect the Navy and is therefore omitted.

Extract from the Report of W. S. Lindsay, Esq., M.P.

It will be urged in objection to my views, that if only a sufficient number of officers are retained on the active list, so that the whole of them would be employed in rotation, the number of naval cadets at present introduced into the service, already greatly curtailed, would be necessarily so reduced that we should be short of midshipmen. This indeed, it is said, is already the case, and that the duties of the midshipmen are now performed by warrant officers. I am, however, of opinion that many of the duties at present performed by midshipmen, might be more satisfactorily performed if they were made to devolve upon warrant officers specially trained to them. The warrant officers may be pronounced to be the most efficient officers on board ships of war. In a memorial addressed to the Noble Lord the Chairman of this Commission, they complain that 'though their duties have become more arduous and responsible, they have been reduced from the position they formerly held, that many emoluments they enjoyed are now withheld, and that "the senior warrant officers have no "reward for war services either by promotion or otherwise." (Memorial, Nov. 1858.)

I am of opinion that the claims of these memorialists should be admitted to a considerable extent, and in acceding to a portion at least of their demands, I would endeavour to obviate the difficulty of a short supply of midshipmen. With this view a higher grade of warrant officers might be established. That superior grade might be made the reward for good services, and he might be re-instated, in whole or in part, in that position of which all warrant officers were dispossessed. The men who attained this superior grade might perform many of the duties which now devolve upon midshipmen. This would operate moreover as another inducement to respectable well-educated youths to enter Her Majesty's service.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

- Admiral Sir Charles Napier, K.C.B.
 Rear-Admiral Alexander Milne.
 Rear-Ad. The Rt. Hon. Lord Clarence Paget, C.B.
 The Rt. Hon. Sir James Graham, Bart., M.P.
 Rear-Admiral George Elliot.
 Admiral Sir George Seymour, K.C.B.
 Commodore Charles Eden, C.B.
 Capt. The Hon. S. T. Carnegie, R.N., C.B.
 Captain L. G. Heath, R.N., C.B.
 Captain W. R. Mends, R.N., C.B.
 Vice-Ad. The Hon. Sir R. S. Dundas, K.C.B.
 Captain J. McNeill Boyd, R.N.
 Captain B. J. Sullivan, R.N., C.B.
 Captain George Randolph, R.N.
 Captain E. P. Charlewood, R.N.
 Commander Thomas Heard, R.N.
 Captain The Hon. Joseph Denman, R.N.
 Sir John Liddell, C.B., M.D., Director-Gen. of the Medical Department of the Navy.
 Mr. Joseph Allen, Superintendent of the Halls, Greenwich Hospital
 Mr. John Ward Nicholls, R.N., Secretary, Greenwich Hospital
 Mr. J. L. Jay, Public Secretary to Governor of Greenwich Hospital
 Mr. Thomas Howels, Gunner, R.N.
 Robert Hall, Carpenter, R.N.
 Richard Jones, Foreman of Riggers, Woolwich Dockyard.
 George Webber, Boatswain, R.N.
 James Uffen, Boatswain, R.N.
 Js. Carden, Boatswain, Portsmouth Dockyard
 George Lumb, Gunner, R.N.
 Mr. William Smith, Boatswain, R.N., Pembroke Yard
 John Donelly, Seaman Rigger, R.N.
 Joseph Burney, Seaman Rigger
 William Peachey, Boatswain's Mate
 Hy. Butler, Leading man of Seamen Riggers
 Commander J. H. Brown, R.N., Registrar-General of Seamen
 Captain Geo. Pierce, R.N., Shipping Master
 Com. Henry Pengelly, R.N., Shipping Master
 Mr. John Howe Brown, Shipping Master
 Mr. George Dunlop, Shipping Master
 Mr. J. T. Towson, Secretary to Local Marine Board, Liverpool
 Mr. Richard Ainley, Shipping Master
 Mr. Conrad H. Greenhow, Shipping Master
 Mr. Robert Jobling, Shipping Master
 Mr. Henry Corlass, Shipping Master
 Mr. John Lambton, Shipping Master
 Mr. Robert Crawford, Shipping Master
 Mr. John McIlvain, Shipping Master
 J. R. Engledue, Esq., Superintendent of Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Company
 William Vincent, Esq., Superintendent of Royal Mail Steam Packet Company
 Captain Harris, R.N.
 Captain R. S. Hewlett, R.N., C.B.
 Captain G. W. Preedy, R.N.
 Commander Bickford, R.N.
 Captain Gambier, R.N.
 Commander C. A. Johnston, R.N.
 Mr R. P. Chaplin, Pay Clerk, Portsmouth Dockyard
 Serjeant Hobbins, Pay Serjt., Royal Marines
 Mr. Anthony Trail, Shipping Master
 Mr. Arthur Stewart, Collector of Customs
 Com. J. Thompson, R.N., Shipping Master
 Mr. Frederick Johns, Shipping Master
 Mr. H. H. Peters, Shipping Master
 Mr. W. Peake, Collector of Customs
 Mr. J. Mackenzie, Collector of Customs
 Mr. Redpath, Collector of Customs
 Rear-Admiral Sir Thomas Maitland, C.B.
 C. H. Pennell, Esq., Chief Clerk, Admiralty
 Charles Richards, Esq., R.N., Comptroller of Victualling and Transport Services
 Mr. W. Hickman, Paymaster, R.N.
 Captain W. H. Walker, of the Board of Trade
 Mr. Moody, Assistant Master Shipwright, Portsmouth Dockyard
 Mr. William Penfold, Accountant, Woolwich Dockyard
 H. R. Williams, Esq., Accountant of the Board of Trade
 T. H. Farrer, Esq., Assistant Secretary to the Marine Department of the Board of Trade
 The Right Hon. Sir Thomas Freemantle, Bart., Chairman of the Board of Customs
 Sir R. M. Bromley, K.C.B., Accountant General of the Navy

Extracts from the Evidence taken before the Royal Commission for Manning the Navy, 1858—9.

Admiral Sir Charles Napier.

I believe that if we increase the pay of the petty officers very considerably, and I would go so far as to give the first-class petty officers £4 a month, and the second class £3 a month; I would raise them in their own estimation, they should always be petty officers, and I would insert their names in the Naval List, that would flatter them, and raise them in their own estimation, and they would be more respected by the ship's company, and would do their duty I think better, and be paid for their responsibility; and I have not the smallest doubt that they would feel themselves in a higher situation than they are, and be looked up to by the men; I would go further, and open the situation of mate to them, which is now enjoyed by the midshipmen; a midshipman passes his examination after six years and becomes a mate, and has duties to attend to which the old masters' mates formerly did. We have now the mate of the hold, the mate of the lower deck, the mate of this and the mate of that, and I believe the duty would be better done by a petty officer who should be raised to that situation; I would allow him to look forward to getting promotion the same as a boatswain or a gunner does. I believe a boatswain can be made a lieutenant, and so can a gunner; I would allow the mates to be made lieutenants, although the prospect is far off.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Clarence Paget.

638. (*Chairman.*) Would you advise any further change in the discipline of the navy, which, while it maintained its efficiency, tended to render the service more popular with the seamen in the merchant service?—I think that we might hold out some inducements by improving the commission of the warrant officers. Their widows have no pension; the pension was taken away from them, and I think it is a very great grievance; I have received communications from them, which prove that it has taken a great hold upon their minds; I have received a printed circular from them in which they grievously complain that the widows' pension was taken away from them; and moreover, that, although the Admiralty held out to them that they should occasionally have lieutenant's commission granted to them, there is no instance in which any one of them has been so promoted. I will read an extract from an Admiralty circular of 1853 in reference to the warrant officers:—"As a further mark of their approbation of the services of this deserving class of officers, my Lords are pleased to direct that warrant officers of exemplary conduct who have distinguished themselves by acts of gallantry and daring in the service, be considered eligible to hold commissions in Her Majesty's fleet, in such rank or position as their Lordships may deem them, after undergoing an examination, entitled to receive and competent to fill. And all warrant officers so promoted will be granted respectively the sum of £100 as an outfit." That has not been carried out in any one instance; and I think it would be a great boon, and it would go like wildfire through the service, if my

Lords did occasionally give a commission and outfit to a warrant officer. I am bound to say that I have had several under my command who were perfectly fit to associate with gentlemen and to perform the duties of commissioned officers; and I should think that their widows' pensions ought to be restored to them.

639. (*Mr. Shepherd.*) Did you ever recommend one of those men to the Admiralty for a commission?—No, I have not; for no opportunity occurred in the ship I commanded, since this circular was issued, for which I was empowered to recommend a warrant officer for an act of gallantry or daring.

640. (*Chairman.*) You are aware I presume that it would require an order in council to promote a warrant officer to be a lieutenant?—No, I am not.

641. Are you not aware that it is contrary to the rules of the service?—I presume that it must be competent to the Admiralty to give them commissions.

642. Have the Admiralty at present the power of raising a warrant officer to be a lieutenant, or even a master to be a lieutenant?—I believe the Admiralty can give a warrant officer a commission.

Earl of Hardwicke to Commodore Henry Eden, C.B.

1353. (*Chairman.*) With reference to the service generally, have you any suggestions to make which in your opinion would tend to an improvement in the service, with reference to the seamen or the warrant officers?—I have. I think one of the most advantageous things to the naval service would be to restore the warrant officer's widows pensions, which I think were most unjustly taken away from them some years ago.

1355 Could you suggest anything with reference to promotion and raising the seamen to a higher rank?—I think that where a warrant officer distinguishes himself by any conspicuous gallantry, it would be a good thing if they were occasionally promoted to the rank of lieutenant.

1356. Is there any bar in the service to the promotion of any man to the rank of lieutenant or even admiral?—I believe none, but within the last 20 or 30 years I believe no man has received the promotion.

1357. Have you not known in the service many officers who have risen from common seamen?—They have not risen within the last 20 or 30 years; there were several.

1358. May it not be presumed that that has been caused by their not having been occasions in which a man has sufficiently distinguished himself to deserve to be raised to that rank, and not from any rule in the service?—It may be so.

1359. Were you ever acquainted with a Captain Askew in the service?—I knew him.

1360. Are you aware that he was the late Sir Joseph Yorke's coxswain?—I was not aware of that fact.

1361. Are you aware that Captain Cogan rose from the ranks?—Yes, I am aware of that.

1362. You are aware that there is no bar to a man rising to be an admiral in the profession, let him be who he may?—I am not aware that there is any bar.

1363. Have you anything further to recommend except with reference to the widows of warrant officers, whose pensions you think should be restored to them?—I think not.

1365. (*Mr. Lindsay.*) Have you calculated, when you recommend that the pensions to the widows of warrant officers should be restored, what cost that would be to the country?—I only looked to the justice of the case.

1368. You recommend that a warrant officer should rise for distinguished service, and be occasionally promoted to the rank of lieutenant?—Yes.

1369. I suppose when you say that, you would not bar them from any further promotion?—No: once a lieutenant, he may rise to any rank.

1386. (*Sir James Elphinstone.*) Warrant officers widows were deprived of their pensions in 1830?—Yes.

1387. Warrant officers received an augmentation of pay at that time, did they not?—Not then, but afterwards. I think in 1853.

1388. Some allowance was made, was there not, with a view to their insuring their lives?—Yes.

1389. I suppose, practically, that no insurance office would take such lives?—I think that a boatswain, going to the Coast of Africa, would find a difficulty in insuring his life at any office.

1390. You consider it a great hardship, do you not, that the widows were deprived of their pensions?—Yes.

1391. Do you think they ought to be restored to them?—Yes.

Captain W. R. Mends, C.B.

I think the warrant officers are deserving of every possible consideration. Their rise into position is great, but the change generally plunges them into debt and difficulty; that has been partly remedied, by a bonus being given—a sum of money. Their pay was augmented a short time ago, in exchange for pensions to their widows; and they were urged to insure their lives; but the warrant officer is at a disadvantage with his neighbour, in the fact that all the insurance companies make a seagoing man pay a higher premium. Many good men decline warrants because the advantages are not equal to the responsibilities. I think the service would be benefited if the present pay were continued and the pensions to the widows restored. They are a class of men who never quit the ship, are exposed to all climates, and from being constantly on deck are liable to frequent accident. I cannot say too much for the class.

1855. (*Chairman.*) Are you aware of the cause that led to the withdrawal of the pensions to the widows of warrant officers?—No, unless it were on account of giving them an increase of present pay.

1886. You are not then aware that the warrant officer, being enabled to pension his widow, always took care to marry a young lady just before he died?—I have heard of that.

1887. Do you know of anything that could be done to remedy any grievance of which the warrant officers complain?—I think it would be a great thing to do something; they are a very exemplary body of men as a class.

1888. (*Mr. Lindsay.*) Do you not think if we were to go back to the system of pensioning the widows of warrant officers there should be some

restriction or condition, such as that the man should have been married for a certain number of years before his widow could be entitled to the pension?—Yes.

1889. What number of years should you say?—From eight to ten years.

1890. (*Commodore Shepherd.*) And marrying under a certain age?—Yes.

Captain J. McNeill Boyd, R.N.

I think that the promotion of warrant officers to the rank of lieutenant for distinguished conduct, the restoration of widows' pensions, and the privilege of nominating a son to Greenwich, would be a great inducement for promising young men to cling to the navy, and accept the warrant. At present, many very eligible petty officers decline the warrant. The pension goes far in enabling a warrant officer to marry well. I attach great value to the good effects of encouraging the men to marry well. A commanding officer may manage the men very much through the agency of the respectable women. Courts-martial on warrant officers have been more frequent since the withdrawal of the widows' pension. Either the wives have not the same influence as heretofore, or these officers have made in some cases inferior connexions.

Captain Hon. Joseph Denman, R.N.

In the navy, the highest rank practically open to a seaman is that of warrant officer. The pay is good, £86 to £120 per annum, and the retirement when superannuated liberal, except as regards the reduced amount allowed for harbour service. The long time warrant officers are kept at harbour service is felt as a great grievance, and the country suffers in their loss of practice. During peace, extra warrant officers might be employed in large ships, with great advantage. Pensions are granted to the widows of all officers, excepting only to those of warrant officers, which were taken away in 1830, because it was ascertained that some widows of warrant officers were living loose lives at the seaports. This measure has been considered not only as a most serious loss, but as a reproach, and is naturally felt by this invaluable class of officers as a blow to their dearest affections. The effect of the withdrawal of the widows' pension has been to cause the promotion to a warrant officer to be by no means generally sought for by our best men.

The vital importance of maintaining the value of the highest prize we offer to the seamen of the navy, is superior to the question whether this pension may not have been sometimes ill bestowed. The progress of this class in the social scale has been great, and the wives of warrant officers at the present moment are in general highly respectable. After an interval of 22 years, some addition to their pay was granted at the recommendation of the Manning Committee in order to enable them to insure their lives, or to save for the support of their families at their death. But how can a warrant officer save out of £86 a year sufficient to make a provision for his wife and children? Or, ordered to China or the Coast of Africa, how is he to maintain a life insurance, the premium of which will of course largely increase when he is serving in unhealthy climates. Every argument of sound policy urges a liberal treatment of warrant officers. The restoration of this pension without reducing the pay—the elevation of the class by treating them with more distinction—

together with the promotion of a certain number to gunners, boatswains, and carpenters, "*of the Fleet*," to serve in flagships, and to rank after lieutenants, would raise the value of the position and cause it to be anxiously sought for. Exceptional cases of extraordinary merit should for the sake of the general effect, be taken advantage of to promote warrant officers to the active list of lieutenants. This is now contemplated by a Circular, but has never yet been done. These measures would effect the great desideratum of making the prize of promotion to a warrant, anxiously sought for. If the position of warrant officers were thus improved, it would not, however, suffice for the objects referred to. The number is too few, and the prospect therefore too remote, to have any very strong general effect in attracting men, and it is most desirable to establish a rating equal to the situation of junior mates of merchant ships.

Mr. Cardwell to Mr. Robert Hall, Carpenter.

3314. I believe you signed the paper that bears Mr. Howels' signature?—Yes.

Admiral Shepherd to Mr. George Webber, Boatswain.

3335. Have you anything to say with respect to the treatment of the seamen?—Yes; there are many grievances in a man-of-war respecting the bum-boat people; they come on board the ship, and remain all day, while the friends of the seamen are only allowed on board at meal times. That is one grievance. Then there is the continuous service, the time that they enter for is long, and when the ship comes home they like to have the choice of joining a ship; they are sent sometimes to the guard-ship in port, and if no vessel wants the men they are then drafted round to other ports. Again, in the lower deck, if a man commits himself in the mess, the whole mess are punished for that one man, and that is another grievance.

3336. Does anything else occur to you?—No, except I think, as to the bread, there is not enough while in harbour on fresh meat, a pound is not enough for two meals

3337. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) You have signed this paper, have you not?—Yes.

3338. Do you agree with its contents?—Yes.

3339. Have you anything to add with regard to the warrant and petty officers?—No; I am satisfied with what is on that paper.

Mr. Cardwell to Mr. J. Uffen, Boatswain.

3362. You signed this paper, I believe?—Yes.

3363. You entirely agree with the contents of it?—Yes.

3364. Have you anything to add to it?—Nothing.

Mr. Cardwell to Mr. James Carden, Master Rigger.

3374. I believe you signed this paper?—Yes.

3375. Therefore you agree with the contents of it?—Yes.

3381. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) In that respect you would add to the strictness of discipline and not diminish it?—I would, but it must be remembered that the

seaman is now better educated, and there is a difference again, and no officer must expect to treat him otherwise than as a rational being, and if he will not do his duty on that, I think it should be fully carried out, and that he should be made to do it.

3382. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) You can state from your own knowledge that the seamen of Her Majesty's fleet are now treated kindly and considerately?—I think so; I do not think that a man has any reason to complain that he is ill treated. There are a few evils spoken of, and I think, if they are remedied, you do every thing for the sailor's comfort in every way, and then make him do the rest. He should do his duty, and he is bound to do his work for the country, that he is paid for, as much as any other person, and it becomes the powers above him to see that he has what he wants.

Admiral Shepherd to Mr. George Lumb, Gunner.

3383. Will you state what your opinions are?—I concur very much with all that has been expressed: first, with reference to the provisions, the bread, I think, should be increased a proportion, and that proportion I leave to the Commissioners. As far as the treatment of the seamen goes, I have had a great deal of practice for the last dozen years, with newly raised men, and with the old established sailors, and I concur quite fully with Mr. Carden's views. I think it is a false philanthropy, showing all kindness to sailors, for they will turn round upon you and treat you with impunity; but this does not come to the captain's ears, but to the subordinate officers, I have laboured under it myself, and I have remonstrated, and said, "Why is not the man punished, to give me satisfaction, as an officer, getting my duty performed?" "Oh, I do not like making these complaints." These are the principal things that are the cause of one-half our young men leaving the service and returning to it again, and then leaving it again. They have treated the men so kindly; if they transgress, the case is not reported to the captain, and they turn round and treat you with impunity, and I have been a sufferer in consequence of the discipline of the ship not being kept up.

3384. You would rather complain of slackness and not strictness of discipline?—Yes; it is not so strict. Since they knocked off with corporal punishment to the extent that they have done, discipline has gone to the dogs.

3385. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) I believe you have signed this paper?—Yes; and I have the welfare of the seamen and petty officers at heart. I rose from them, and I do not like to see the case abused.

3386. With regard to this paper, may we take it that you entirely agree with it?—Yes.

3393. With regard to the warrant and petty officers you agree entirely in the statements in this paper, and subject to this paper you consider that the warrant and petty officers are in a satisfactory position?—The petty officers, not the warrant officers.

3394. Except for what is stated in this paper?—Yes.

3395. Then, with regard to the warrant officers, you wish what this paper contains to be carried into effect?—At the discretion of the Commissioners.

3396. With regard to the petty officers you are satisfied?—There is one more sore place with regard to them, and that is the petty officer who earns

his service at the peril of his life, and serves the whole of his time at sea—he does not see the reason why he should be put off with from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 7d. a day, and that a serjeant of marines should have 2s. a day, a man who has done his duties in the barrack ground,

Earl of Hardwicke to Mr. W. Smith, Boatswain.

3400. (*Chairman.*) You are a boatswain?—I am the boatswain of Pembroke dockyard.

3401. I believe you signed the paper addressed to me by the warrant officers headed by Thomas Howels?—I did sign one paper.

3402. You signed the paper addressed to “The “Earl of Hardwicke, Chairman of the commission for Manning the Navy,” setting forth certain grievances, of which the warrant officers complain, did you not?—Yes.

3403. Have you anything to add to that statement, or do you agree with the first proposition, that you suffer inconvenience from the loss of the rank which you held before in the service, and that you are now placed next to a cadet, instead of after the second master?—Yes. I have been many times very much annoyed, in carrying out my duties in a ship, by the young gentlemen, and one or two instances I can name; one was when as boatswain of a ship I had to attend in getting the cock-pit hammocks up, and I have been told by the young gentlemen when I have said I would lower them down if they did not get up. that they were my superior officers. I have been told so when they have had the charge of the fore-castle, when they have been doing duty on the fore-castle, as mates of the fore-castle; If I have hailed the top or the foreyard, I have been told by the midshipman, that he was the officer of the fore-castle.

3404. (*Mr. Green.*) Was that a midshipman or a naval cadet?—A midshipman, the son of an admiral, I believe now in the service, and had it not been that the father knew me very well and supported me, I should probably have got into trouble.

3405 You are desirous to be placed now, in point of rank, next to the second master?—I think that the warrant officers being placed next to the second master would place them in a good position to rank with them.

3406. Are you of opinion that the size of the ships has entailed upon the warrant officers and boatswains a heavier charge?—Yes, there is no doubt about it; the ships have all increased and the stores are more.

3407. The loss of rank is also a loss of prize-money, and check-money, and other advantages in war, is it not?—Yes, there is no doubt of it, my lord.

3408. Do you also consider that the pay of the other officers has increased, while the pay of the warrant officers has been kept stationary?—The pay has been increased, but from what I understand of the pay of the different classes, the warrant officers have not received their proportion.

3409. Have you any suggestion to make in reference to the pay, or what you consider would place you in a position of proportionate advantage with other officers?—Individually I should say, that if the pay of the third-class officers was equal to the old first-class pay—that is in 1795—it would be better. We find the pay very small to keep a sepa-

rate mess, and to appear respectably and to provide ourselves with a decent quantity of linen, that is necessary for a long voyage, without being compelled to have them scrubbed by the seamen.

3410. Do the warrant officers now mess together?—I believe not; I have been out of a man-of-war for many years, but I believe it would be very advantageous, if they had a mess place, particularly in hot weather. If they could mess together, and any small place were allotted to them, there is no doubt that it would be agreeable, and having a proper servant to attend upon them, not a second-class boy who has just come into the service.

3411. You think it would be a great advantage if the warrant officers messed together?—Yes.

3412. Do you think that if one of the cabins was increased in size, that would enable an arrangement of that sort to be made?—I think it would be a great convenience for the warrant officers to have one cabin in addition to mess in; they are usually married men, and if they come into harbour, they cannot go on shore like the other officers. I never went out of the ship in my life, or I will not say never, but I never made a practice of it, I always found that I had enough to look after in after hours when the men were gone; you have little accounts to make up in the evening, or probably one wants to go to bed.

3413. You are a boatswain of a dockyard, can you suggest anything with reference to the position of the boatswains of dockyards that would be an improvement in their condition?—If I look back, the boatswains have received no increase of pay with the first-class boatswains.

3414. The letter states that the pay of the boatswain of a dockyard has been decreased £50 a year?—I think so; it used to be £250 a year, it is now £200, and the boatswain of a dockyard must have a servant or some one to provide his meals, and a room for that servant, and fire, for he cannot conveniently go out to call the servant, or sit down with the servant.

3415. The boatswain of a dockyard has a residence in the yard?—Yes, generally; I have a residence just outside the yard.

3416. Are you allowed coal and candle?—No; some chips, which all the officers resident are allowed.

3417. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) You mean to say that you have an allowance for a house outside?—No, I am allowed a house in addition to my pay.

3418. You do not pay the rent of the house?—No; I believe the scale for the warrant officers, that they are allowed, is 6d. a day for lodging money, 1s. 6d. altogether, or something of that sort.

3419. (*Chairman.*) Have you any perquisites at all from the dockyard?—None, and I have to attend at all hours.

3420. No fuel?—Some chips; some are allowed every six weeks, that has been a new regulation, that is the only thing.

3421. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) You are allowed the same quantity of chips that the superintendent is allowed?—Yes.

3422. (*Mr. Green.*) How long will they last?—They do for lighting fires, and they last probably six weeks.

3423. (*Chairman.*) I believe that which is felt to be the greatest hardship in your positions is the loss of the pensions to your widows?—It is, that is the great cry.

3424. Do you think that that has an effect upon the minds of the seamen?—I am quite sure it has in many instances that I have known. I know from my own father. He served for about 40 years in the navy, and he never would have taken the warrant only for that, as he would have been entitled 14 years before to the same pension that he received 14 years after, but at that time the warrant officers' wives were allowed an annuity, and having a very large family, it induced him to accept the warrant, though he had been offered it many times before and refused, but the pay was too small, and he often said he could not support his family to keep a position of respectability.

3425. Have you ever known excellent seamen refuse a warrant?—I have known it, and there is one now, I believe here, who was with me as captain of a top when I was boatswain of the "Winchester," Mr. Lane, and it was a great difficulty to get him to take the warrant; he was a very good man, and I told the commander that I thought so, and that he would do justice to the duties and make a good officer.

3426. (*Mr. Green.*) Did he accept the warrant?—He did after a great deal of persuasion, but at first he refused on account of the pay being too small. He said, "No, I do not think I shall remain by the service," but I persuaded him and said, that I thought there was nothing like a man-of-war for cleanliness and discipline, that there was nothing like it.

3427. You never knew a man positively refuse it?—Yes, I have known men positively refuse it, they would not take it.

3428. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that they were influenced more by the loss of the pension to the widow than by anything else?—I do not believe that many of them perfectly understood it at the time, but I think it would be a great inducement for good men to accept it, if this was held out to them, it is so universally known now. I think there are ten to one sailors married now to what there were in my young days, they have more leave I suppose.

3429. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) Is the class of women to whom they get married improved?—There is no doubt about it, very much; they are not at all of the same race, for many reasons that I know of. X When first I was a seaman, the first ship I was in, I was nearly four years in the East Indies; and when we came home the women were allowed on board the ship, and scenes took place, intimacies were formed between them, and frequently they were married afterwards. X Now, if the men get leave, they are generally steady; there may be a solitary case, but they are generally more acquainted with respectable families.

3430. The rule now with them is more to get acquainted with decent girls?—Yes, generally speaking. We seldom hear of anything of the sort now, not with the respectable men. I have known many, and I have taken the trouble to inquire of late years, but there is no doubt there was a great deal of it in former times.

3431. There is a great improvement, is there not, in the streets of seaport towns?—Yes. They have not the money in the first place. They are paid, and get leave on shore; and they are not so wild, and they are now of very much better habits. Sailors are not tormented, as they were in my time; they are not harassed so much.

3432. They are treated more like rational men?—They are, indeed.

3433. (*Chairman.*) You think that the mode of paying the seamen in small sums, instead of giving him a large sum of money at the close of his service, is a great advantage to the man?—I do. I think there was too large a sum paid.

3434. Payments from time to time, instead of paying a gross amount at the end of the man's servitude, have been a great benefit to the sailor in a moral point of view?—Yes.

3435. There is less temptation to the sharks and prostitutes to assail him than there was before?—Most certainly; they have an opportunity frequently of going on shore, and when they find that, they generally take care of their money, saying, "I shall have another opportunity of going again, I must take care of some of this."

3436. (*Mr. Green.*) The seamen are better educated now, are they not, than formerly?—Yes.

3437. Most of them can write their names?—Yes, and, indeed, some can work navigation. I have known plenty of them that could work a day's work.

3438. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) They have the means now of improving themselves?—Yes, by the seamen's schoolmaster, and particularly the young men who are brought up in the service.

3439. They get a good education on board the brigs?—Yes, and they often pursue it on board. In the last ship that I was in, the "Superb," when she was in commission, we had boys come on board as apprentices, and they were paid off as able seamen; they then joined a sloop-of-war, with Captain Hamilton, in the "Vestal," he was an old shipmate of mine, and he asked me if I could recommend these brig's lads for his ship, and he gave them second-class petty officers' ratings, and they turned out very smart lads.

3400. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that the improvement in the mind of the seaman, such as you have described, has militated against that daring, dashing activity, which always exhibits itself in the naval service?—No, I do not. No doubt you must forgive a sailor his little eccentricities ashore, and his little whims, because if he was a far-seeing, deep-thinking man, there are many of those daring acts, such as jumping into a boat when there is a man overboard, that he would not do if he was a thoughtful man.

3441. (*Mr. Green.*) Then how do you account for the officer jumping into the boat first?—An officer will always do that to lead the others. I have jumped into a boat myself.

3442. (*Chairman.*) Are you of opinion that there is as much appearance of discipline, and of proper order, among the seamen in performing the duties of a man-of-war as there was before their minds were so much improved?—I should say, certainly, yes.

3443. Then I infer from that, that you think that Her Majesty's ships are, generally speaking, in as high a state of discipline as they were formerly?—Not on their first commission, because there are not the seamen now to be had; but about 1846 I should speak of, when I think it was generally considered it was a good navy, about the time of the squadron being in Lisbon. But when they were paid off there were no ships fitting out; and lots of men came to me, to recommend them simply to take a seaman's rating, and many men left and went out to different

countries, simply for their provisions, with no pay. I happened to know one of the captains in a merchant ship, who had taken some of these men, and he told me of one or two men that I recommended to him, and said that he certainly should give the men something at the end of the voyage, but he was not bound to do so. They were some men paid off from the "Canopus."

3444. I see, by the petition, in addition to the points I have stated, that there is a complaint made in reference to wounds and hurts, that the scale does not meet the views of the warrant officers; what would be your position suppose you were badly wounded and lost an arm?—I never knew, and it is a question that has been asked. It appears quite a mystery.

3445. The paper states, that the "warrant officers receiving wounds "or hurts, and still fit to serve, were formerly allowed a pension according to the nature of the injury. This is nearly wholly abolished, nor "is any additional sum granted for the same when superannuated;" are you aware that that is the case?—No.

3446. Then the paper states that there are "no rewards for war service?"—I received a hurt myself, and got a certificate from the surgeon.

3447. Did you receive any money?—No.

3448. Was the hurt of a serious nature?—Yes; and I shall suffer from it as long as I live. It was done in an act of duty, and I had the surgeon's certificate. I received the injury in the execution of my duty, and it interferes with me at any time when I am suffering from wets or colds, or after any undue exertion.

3449. For that, you have never received any remuneration?—None.

3450. Do you suffer from this hurt now?—Yes; I always suffer from it, and it is very troublesome.

3451. I perceive there is a complaint made also that there is "no promotion," and "no rewards for war service." Do you mean by that there is no promotion above the rank of a warrant officer?—That there is no promotion for the first-class officers, although a man might have been ten years or twelve years a first-class warrant officer; but we have no rewards held out to us, and many were in the last war.

3452. There is a minute contained in an Admiralty circular, which does hold out a prospect of promotion to the first-class warrant officers; have you never seen that?—Yes; I have seen it.

3453. Has that minute ever been acted upon?—I never heard of it. I have been informed by some of the officers that their captains have recommended them. I know one that I can speak of, that I know positively. I think Mr. Spry, a gunner, told me so.

3454. He was recommended by his captain for promotion?—Yes.

3455. (*Mr. Green.*) Would he accept it, if it was offered to him?—I do not know; he would not be aware of what he would get, but he would have been proud of something, being a first-class officer, and serving in the war. I was in the dockyard at Plymouth at the time. He was a boy with me on different stations. He joined the navy, as a second-class boy, the same as I did, about the same time.

3456. (*Chairman.*) The last request made in this document is that the boatswains of the royal navy may be exempted from inflicting corporal punishment, do you agree with that?—Most heartily. I have heartily

prayed for it. It is one of the greatest degradations to an officer to have to pull off his coat, in the midst of a ship's company, to inflict punishment. I have known many men, and good men, that I have been inclined to recommend, and I have asked the commander or the first lieutenant to intercede with the captain to get them rated as boatswain's mates, but they have refused for that very reason, to be made boatswain's mates.

3457. Although it is a very painful duty for any man to inflict corporal punishment upon another, do you think that the service could be carried on without corporal punishment?—My opinion is, that there requires some very severe and strict punishment for cases that occur on board a man-of-war.

3458. Should you like, being yourself a real seaman, being liable to be called upon to perform the active duties of a seaman to serve in a man-of-war, where corporal punishment was abolished?—I am quite sure that it requires some punishment that would deter some desperate characters that there are.

3459. Therefore, as you consider that some very severe punishment is necessary to be inflicted in the service—judiciously applied, of course—the duty of the infliction of that description of punishment must fall upon somebody?—Yes.

3460. Would it not be likely that all men would object upon the same ground to inflict this description of punishment as well as the boatswain's mate?—I think not; I think the police of the ship, for instance; we know from experience that the drummers in the army inflict the punishments, and there are very few officers who do not consider themselves superior to drummers; but from what I have seen, I have never known the ship's corporal or the man in that position, seldom hesitate to carry out an order, such as lashing a man, or gagging him, if he is a noisy, quarrelsome fellow that was alarming the whole ship.

3461. I do not perceive the difference in the minds of the ship's corporal or the boatswain's mate?—No; but he sees this position before him.

3462. The boatswain's mate sees this position before him?—Yes, and then he will not take it.

3463. Do you mean to assert that the seamen now all refuse to take rating of boatswains' mates, from the fact that they are obliged to inflict corporal punishment?—I have known solitary cases of it.

3464. Should you object to inflict corporal punishment, as a boatswain, under any circumstances?—If it was possible that I could refuse.

3465. Supposing that the boatswain, and all the boatswains' mates, refused to inflict corporal punishment at once, when called upon to perform it on the quarter-deck, what would be the position of that ship?—Very bad.

3466. Suppose the captain called upon the officers to perform it, as it requires muscular strength to perform it, would it be right that the warrant officer should refuse?—Certainly not, in that case.

3467. Then you would have no objection to inflict corporal punishment if there was a mutinous attempt on the part of the boatswains' mates or any other men, to refuse to perform it?—Certainly not, under those circumstances.

3468. You would see no objection to performing that unpleasant duty, provided necessity obliged you to do it?—In case the discipline of the

ship was in danger, as an officer I should think I was bound to do anything I was ordered by the commanding officer.

3469. From what body of men are the ship's corporals generally taken? Are they not seamen?—Not generally.

3470. What have they been before in life, generally speaking?—They have been bandsmen; some are servants. The master-at-arms has usually been in the army, or rather in the marines. At least, a great number of them have been; and many of them have been stewards. They have had a little education, enough to keep books and accounts.

3471. Do you think generally speaking that they could perform that duty?—Quite so; they are strong men, and men who have not generally suffered from wets and colds, or exposure, except those that have been taken from the marines.

3472. Have you ever heard this question put to that class of men, whether they would be likely to take the same line of objection to it that you do?—No.

3473. Do you think that they would not?—I do not know, but I have seen them do so when the boys were to be caned. It was a very common case, if a boy disobeyed, or was insolent, he was caned, and in many cases that acted beneficially to the service in some cases where it was slightly used.

3474. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) Generally with regard to punishments, you think it would be an inducement to good men to look forward to the position of boatswain, if they were relieved from the necessity of inflicting corporal punishments?—I do.

3475. You think that the discipline of the ship would not suffer at all, and the punishment would be inflicted in the proper manner, if that duty were to devolve upon the police of the ship?—I believe that that is the prevailing opinion.

3476. With regard to the boys, is it a good thing for them to be allowed to act as servants?—I think you cannot do away with them unless you introduce some ordinary seamen, or landsmen.

3477. Would it not be better to have servants to do the duty of servants alone, and not to take boys who expect to come into the service as seamen?—Quite so.

3478. You think that it would be better, if they were not employed as servants at all, if suitable substitutes could be obtained?—Yes.

3479. I understood you to say that your pay had been reduced, and your responsibility increased, is that so?—Yes.

3480. You have a larger amount of stores, and more valuable property under your care now than you had before?—As boatswain of a dockyard my pay has been decreased, it is not so much as it was.

3481. But the property you have charge of in the dockyard has increased in value?—Very much.

3482. You are the boatswain of a dockyard, what do you think of the propriety of putting men into hulks. do you think that system is a good one, when fitting out a ship?—No.

3483. Is there not very great loss of time in the men proceeding backwards and forwards to their work?—I have known times when we could not get to the ships to dinner, I have been fitting out at Portsmouth, which is a small harbour, and I could not get from the yards to one of the hulks

opposite, and it takes place more frequently at Devonport. It is the only harbour where I have been doing duty in a dockyard, and I have had frequently to go ashore to assist in securing ships in the basin, or striking her spars when they have been rigged in the basin.

3484. A great number of the men belonging to these ships, commonly, are very short of clothes, are they not?—They are.

3485. In going to and fro from these hulks, they are exposed and get wet through, and they have no change of clothing?—They are just as they stand upright; many of these are long-shore men, they are not seamen, scarcely any of them, and they have no more than one suit, and they go on shore, and probably get wet, and remain so the whole day, shivering, so that we could not get them to work.

3486. The effect is eventually to put them on to the doctor's list?—Yes.

3487. Do you think, if suitable clothing were issued to the men on joining, and that the payment for the clothing was spread over the first three years of their commission, the men would object to it?—No.

3488. Would it be a relief to them?—I think it should not be compulsory upon them to take the clothing; I know that very many seamen do not like the cut of the purser's rig.

3489. If a seaman was short of clothes, or had none of a decent kind, he would not object to receiving old clothing, in the way I have suggested, nor to pay for it in the way I have pointed out?—They would be very glad to get it, instead of getting it as they do now, and paying twice its value. They go to a tailor who is always ready to supply them, and will serve them with a frock, or trousers, and charge them twice their value.

3490. Do you think that, if they received clothes in the way spoken of, it would operate to prevent desertion?—I do not think it would make any difference.

3491. Do you think that by an improvement in the police, desertion might be prevented, and that in that way the Government would not lose money?—Very little; the value of the serge frock and trousers would be soon paid for, and a pair of shoes. This class of men seldom desert until they get well filled, and they remain some time; they are generally hungry when they come, and they eat the allowance of all those good men who have a house and friends on shore.

3492. If they were well clothed, that would be another inducement for them to remain?—I think so.

3493. Is it not a great hardship, at present, that the men are not able to allot any money to their wives?—Yes, I have heard very many times complaints of that.

3494. Do you think that, if a man received his pay weekly, on joining a ship, it would meet the difficulty?—I think it would. That did not occur to me, but I think it would be a very good thing.

3495. A man's wife could maintain herself respectably without parting with her clothes?—I think so.

3496. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Have the seamen of the fleet any just cause of complaint with reference to the manner in which they are treated on board of Her Majesty's ships of war, and if you think they have, will you state what it is?—I can state one or two, and one is the length of time they are kept on foreign stations.

3497. Are they tyrannized over now?—Quite the contrary; there may be single cases, but as far as the treatment I have received in ships I have been in, goes quite the contrary.

3498. Are the men kindly and considerably treated?—In all the ships that I have been in of late years, they have been.

3499. Have they any complaints to make with reference to their allowance of provisions?—The quantity, in one or two instances, is certainly not enough for a sailor. The bread, I should speak of first, they have not enough. In my time I have been four hours on deck in the morning watch, and have come down, and not had a mouthful of bread of any description, not even the dust; I have had nothing. Off Cape Horn I have been on the main-topsail-yard, as captain of the main-top, and I have come down below, and had a pinch of snuff for my breakfast.

3500. You consider that an increase in the allowance of bread would be most acceptable to the fleet?—Yes, no doubt, and it would be an inducement for men to join from the merchant service. I know a man, named Beard, who joined the "Superb," when I was boatswain of her, from a merchant ship in Queenstown. I do not know how long he served, but I think three years. We were ordered home from the Mediterranean, and when we came to Spithead the ship was not paid off, but we were paid some portion of the pay, and this man and others have been many times heard to say, that the only thing they disliked the service for, was that there was not enough bread.

3501. Have you ever heard the seamen complain of shortness in the allowance of beef or pork?—I have heard of it in this way, that they have been very glad to get their allowance, part of it, served out, that they might have it for their breakfast, and they considered it a very good boon; they used to let them take one piece, say, to the mess, of pork, and that was taken for breakfast, and then they appeared quite satisfied, and they would willingly give up that portion at dinner time for something at breakfast.

3502. You think that the allowance of beef and pork is sufficient, but the manner of serving it out is not so satisfactory as it might be?—There is no doubt that the men require some little thing for breakfast, seamen generally consider themselves satisfied in a great measure for the day.

3503. Do you mean something in addition, or a part of the present allowance, served out for the breakfast?—I cannot speak so well now from experience, but when I was before the mast, we had only three quarters of a pound.

3504. Have our seamen as much leave as the duties of the ships will admit of?—In the last ten years, I have seen quite as much leave given as the duties of the ship would admit of.

3505. Is it your honest opinion, that the seamen of the fleet are kindly, considerably, and indulgently treated, in the present day?—There are a few grievances that I have heard sailors complain of, and that I may speak of, and as to which they do not think that they are treated as comfortably as they might be, for instance, washing clothes at night, that is one thing; these are little things that they complain of a great deal. A smart seaman likes to see his frock and white trousers clean, and they do not like to wash in the dark, they have to stand between the guns, and frequently if I have had the middle watch, I have left it at 4 o'clock, and then I have stayed up and washed my clothes.

3506. Have you ever heard them complain of the time at which they were obliged to take their meals, that it was too early in the morning?—Yes; I have heard that frequently. In the East Indies frequently, I think, we breakfasted at 4 o'clock in the morning.

3507. Why did you go to breakfast at 4 o'clock in the morning?—I cannot say.

3508. Was there any service to be performed that was particular?—Nothing particular.

3509. There was no reason for going to breakfast at four, you might just as well have gone to breakfast at seven or eight?—Yes.

3510. What do you think is the most convenient time for the seamen to breakfast, speaking generally?—Seven o'clock.

3511. Six bells?—Yes. We will suppose that a man gets up at four or five o'clock, he might be up at four, for the morning watch.

3512. Then with the exception of the cases you have mentioned, are you or not prepared to say that the seamen of the fleet are kindly, considerately, and indulgently treated?—From what I understand from them, and my own experience, with these few annoyances, there may be others that I might have experienced, I do not know that they are altered now.

3513. But they were not so serious as to leave any lasting impression on your mind?—None.

3514. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) If these little grievances were removed, would it be your opinion that the men in the navy have few or no causes of complaint?—I think that their pay altogether is small compared with the merchant service.

3515. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) What is it that keeps the merchant seamen out of the Queen's service?—These are the reasons: they consider in the first place, that there is a great deal of what they call nonsense. If you ask them what it is, although I do not follow their views, they say that there is too much drill. I have generally found men-of-war's men to like a little drill, but not carried to the extent that it has been carried; it is rather an amusement than otherwise, a little of it, but in some cases, where it is carried to too great an extent, I have heard them come on deck grumbling. I never did when I was before the mast, but since I have been in a large ship I have heard them say, "Here we are roused out of our mess," the tables are triced up, and the guns are taken for drill, probably where they were messing.

3516. Upon the whole, and generally speaking, do you think that the seamen are better treated in Her Majesty's ships or in the mercantile navy?—I think that the man-of-war's man is better treated, provided he could be allowed a little more provision, than in any other service; he has generally a clean and a dry bed; sometimes it may get wet, but from what I have seen in the merchant vessels, and I have been on board of many during the last war; I was on board all the transports, and assisted in shipping all the horses, and a great portion of the transport stores that left Devonport. I could see the dirty hovels that they lived in, and I would not, if they had given me three times the pay, have gone on board.

3517. Is it your opinion that there is less brutality in the navy than in the merchant service in the treatment of our seamen?—Yes.

3518. Is there any brutality at all in Her Majesty's service?—I have never seen any, not brutality. I have seen some severe treatment a few years back.

3519. But there is none of that in the present day?—Not that I have seen, or that I could complain of.

3520. (*Sir J. Elphinstone.*) I suppose you find that when merchant seamen join the navy their habits are dirty, and their movements slow?—The greater portion of them.

3521. In point of fact, they have to be got out of those ways before they can possibly take to the duties of the ship?—That they have.

The witness withdrew.

Sir James Elphinstone to J. R. Engledue, Esq., Superintendent of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company.

4682. What do you think are the real causes of the distaste for the Navy, and which prevents men from freely joining?—There are a great variety of causes; there are many sore points, and for some years one was the doing away with pensions for warrant officers' widows. They felt that that was a breach of trust and confidence. It prevented a great many good men, such as boatswains' mates and carpenters' mates taking the warrant, because they felt that there was no ultimate advantage, and they preferred serving out their time as first-class petty officers, and getting their pension, and going into some other service. Then again, they say, "The fact is, we are never certain of anything that is going on in the navy. The Admiralty is always changing. One set of Lords make one law, and stop in a few months, and then in come another set and capsize all the old rules; in fact, we feel a want of confidence in the Admiralty, they are so continually changing the rules and regulations of the service."

Admiral Shepherd to Admiral Sir Thomas Maitland.

5628. In your opinion, should pensions to the widows of the warrant officers be restored?—I think so; I think it was a hard case the warrant officers' widows losing their pensions.

5629. (*Marquis of Chandos.*) It has appeared in evidence that they have received no pension since 1830, but that the warrant officers have received some additional pay?—I think that the widows ought to receive pensions; and I think there are cases in which good men have refused warrants in consequence of knowing that their widows would not receive any pensions.

Mr. Cardwell to C. H. Pennell, Esq., Chief Clerk of the Admiralty.

5654. Will you favour us with your opinion as to the claim which the warrant officers make for a renewal of pensions to their widows; and first, will you state the grounds upon which those pensions were withdrawn?—First, for financial reasons; and secondly, on moral considerations.

5655. Will you be good enough to explain the nature of the moral considerations?—The fact of a man being married led him naturally to shrink

from sea service, and he was not so ready to accept it as before. It was ascertained, moreover, that a considerable number of widows were living with other men without declaring their marriage; the result being that those who were conscientious lost their pensions in consequence of their re-marriage, and those who were not conscientious lived in a state of concubinage with other men.

5656. Does it fall within your knowledge that there is any condition of things in the army which is cognate to this of the pensions to the widows of warrant officers?—I do not know of any class in the army corresponding to that of the warrant officers.

5657. Can you state what the cost to the country would be, of returning to the practice of allowing pensions to the widows of warrant officers?—There are about 1,000 warrant officers on the list, and the expense would be under £20,000 annually.

5658. (*Admiral Shepherd.*) Suppose the same limit were put that was put with regard to commissioned officers, viz., that no widow should claim a pension who had been married after her husband was 60; would that, in your opinion, obviate any of the moral objections?—No; because that rule was in force when the results already referred to followed.

5659. (*Mr. Cardwell.*) Upon the whole, looking at this question upon moral considerations, you retain your objections?—Yes; I would rather increase considerably the pay of the warrant officers, and leave them to provide for their own widows.

5660. Will you state to the Commission how this matter was dealt with by the Committee of 1852?—The Committee acted upon the principle I have suggested; that is, they increased the pay of the warrant officers, and they appealed to their good feeling to make a provision for their widows.

5661. What do you consider to be the position of the warrant officers now in the Queen's service?—I do not consider that his position, either as to pay or rank, is equal to the very important duties which he is called upon to perform.

5662. You would recommend that some improvement should be made?—Yes, both in his rank and pay.

5663. Where would you place him in point of rank?—He should, in my opinion, come immediately after the second masters.

5664. What increase of pay would you give him?—I would expend the sum which might be appropriated for pensions to the widows, in increasing the pay of the officers.

5665. You acknowledge the justice of the claim, financially speaking, for the widow's pension, but you think that the former mode of giving it was particularly objectionable?—Yes.

5666. You would recommend an additional £20,000 per annum to be allowed to the warrant officers in the navy, but that it should not go in the shape in which it was formerly given?—Yes.

Mr. Cardwell to Sir R. M. Bromley, K.C.B.

6204. If the Government were to grant the request which has been made by the warrant officers to restore to their widows their pensions, and they were also to consider it retrospectively, so as to include the widows of those who

had died since the widows' pensions were withdrawn, what would be the item that we ought to enter on that head?—£19,150, provided the pension of the widow was the same, £25 a year.

6205. That would cover the whole?—It would cover the whole of your proposed cost.

Captain Henry Chads, R. N.

Promotion from the ranks is not, I believe, generally speaking, popular with military officers. It would, no doubt, be an unpopular step with naval officers in general.

But when we consider how well this system is working in the army, and the number of young meritorious men who have been advanced from the ranks in the last few years, together with the ease with which we have of late raised recruits for our army in India, which I believe may be very much attributed to this measure of promotion, we shall not do amiss seriously to consider if we may not, to some extent at any rate, adopt it in the navy.

I am aware that there is already a regulation by which, in *extraordinary* cases, a warrant officer *can* be promoted to be a commissioned officer, receiving £100 as an outfit. Let this rule still remain for very extreme cases. But as it is at present a dead letter, from never having been acted upon, it is no incentive to sailors. The step from a warrant officer to a lieutenant is certainly a very great one.

Why should there not be an intermediate step to the rank of mate or second master?

I believe, myself, that we lost a great opportunity of a step in the right direction during the Crimean war.

I have been told that there were many most enterprising, well-informed young warrant officers in the naval brigade, and that very many gallant acts were from time to time performed by them, acts worthy of advancement, performed by men well deserving of and fit for promotion.

One sees many young gunners in the present day who have taken first-class certificates from the "Excellent," who are clever at figures, have some slight knowledge of trigonometry, to the extent, at any rate, of taking angles and working out distances, who can write an excellent hand and express themselves well, having at the same time a thorough knowledge of their profession as seamen; men, in fact, as worthy of a commission in their own service as any colour-serjeant in the army of his; with this material advantage too in their case, that they are already of a superior rank to the serjeant, already "warrant" officers, and that the jump in rank for them, therefore, is less than for him.

I think if it were certain that a seaman might not only by good character and intelligence become a petty officer, and then a warrant officer, but by extraordinary merit, ability, or gallantry might become a commissioned officer, that this fact would exert a very powerful stimulus on the naval service.

Now it is notorious that at the present time we are very short of second-masters, and that bye-and-bye, if we cannot find some means of recruiting that class of officers, we shall be in want of masters for our ships.

I would propose that, for special service performed, warrant officers (that is boatswains and gunners) should be advanced to the rank of mates, or more

particularly to that of second-masters, (but retaining their former pay, or the pay of a gunner or boatswain of the first-class, and receiving always in such cases £50 or £100, or whatever other sum might be thought right to procure an outfit,) when every facility should be afforded them to enable them to qualify themselves to pass their examinations for lieutenants or masters, and a reasonable hope be held out to them of promotion to one of those ranks when they had done so.

Captain W. B. Oliver, R.N.

WHY MEN DO NOT ENTER.

First.—Wear and tear of clothes in fitting out, and no allowance to make the same good.

Second.—Dislike herding with trash.

Third.—Loss of grog.

Fourth.—Loss of prize money.

Fifth.—*Harass* in training, and no spare time allowed.

Sixth.—Loss of pensions to warrant officers' widows.

PROPOSED REMEDIES.

First.—Fatigue dress to be supplied for dirty work, and bounty of £20 for every first-rate thorough A.B. on entering for 10 years, to be paid in four instalments, the first when ready for sea, the others on the completion of the third, sixth, and ninth years of service. Every soldier costs the country £50 before he is a soldier fit for duty; why then is not a thorough ready-made A.B. worth £20, and petty officers a higher bounty?

Second.—Ships not to be hastily filled up with the scum of the earth, from Bristol, Liverpool, Cork, &c., to the disgust of all good and orderly men.

Third.—The present allowance of grog to be increased to admit of an evening's glass, or the captain and officers to be put in the same position as their men by a stoppage of their *wine* and spirits.

Fifth.—A *secret confidential* order issued to all captains, limiting the time to be devoted daily to drill; and ordering a "rope-yarn Sunday" when practicable. Any captain disobeying these orders, or publishing them, to be immediately superseded without promulgating the cause.

Sixth.—Pensions to be restored to the widows of warrant officers.

Captain W. F. Glanville, R. N.

He strongly recommends the expediency of restoring the pensions to the widows of warrant officers.

J. W. Armstrong, Master, R.N.

That the position and pay of warrant officers should be improved instead of being looked down upon as they now are, and that the pensions to the widows should be restored.

*Cambridge Terrace, Lake Road, Portsea.
March 8th, 1859.*

SIR,

I humbly beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of the Report of the Royal Commission for Manning the Navy, and to return my sincere thanks for the same; the Warrant Officers are truly thankful to the Royal Commission for their recommendation of a Pension to their Widows, and also their Position next Second Masters, and they also pray that some points mentioned in their Memorial might not be lost sight of by the Admiralty, (while the subject of Manning the Navy is before them), which if granted, would greatly benefit the Class without injury to others, or incurring additional expense. First,—Their position next Second Masters being recommended, they pray that a Relative Rank in the Army equal to that enjoyed by Second Masters be assigned to the Warrant Officers. The loss of Rank has been a pecuniary loss to the Class; the Warrant Officers of the Naval Brigade in India, received only Three Rupees per day for subsistence, while the Midshipmen and Assistant Engineers received each Seven Rupees per day. Retirement after an aggregate of (say) 30 years services, with a definite scale according to the length of time warranted. The Warrant Officers are the only Class constantly employed, and from their diversified and active duties are worn out at a much earlier period of life than other grades of the service; there are other points named in the Memorial that may be granted by the Admiralty, which would induce the best Petty Officers to accept Warrants. Trusting Sir, you will not consider us troublesome,

We are, Sir,

Your very obedient Servants,

THE DEPUTATION.

Signed in their behalf, T. H. HOWELS, Gunner, R.N.

H. C. Rothery, Esq., Secretary.

*28, Abingdon Street, Westminster,
March 12th, 1859.*

SIR,

In reply to your letter of the 8th inst., I beg to acquaint you that the Royal Commission on Manning the Navy, having sent in their Report to Her Majesty, any communication that you may have to make on matters mentioned in your Memorial, but to which the Commission have not adverted in their Report, should be addressed to the Secretary of the Admiralty.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

H. C. ROTHERY, Secretary.

*To Mr. T. H. Howels, Gunner, R.N.
Cambridge Terrace, Lake Road, Portsea.*

CONCLUSION.

The Report of the Royal Commission having been laid before Her Majesty, their labors terminate and correspondence ceases. The Names of all the Witnesses examined are inserted; and Extracts taken from the Evidence, &c., of each and all who have wrote or spoke in behalf of our Class, leaving the reader to draw his own conclusion. The best thanks of the Warrant Officers are tendered to each individual (of whatever station in life) that have wrote, spoke, or in any way labored to improve their condition, to some we owe a debt of gratitude that time will never pay,—we refrain from mentioning names, the insertion of some and the omission of others, might cause jealousy; conscience is a faithful monitor, and where praise is due receive such from grateful hearts; and to those who have been as a millstone round our necks for so many years, do not let the cry of the Fatherless and Widow sharpen the thorn in your dying pillow, but let the past suffice and let your future days be devoted in healing the breach, by using all diligence to promote the welfare of the Class. The Reader will perceive that every legitimate means has been taken to lay before the Royal Commission, a plain, true, unvarnished tale of their decline during the past thirty years, and that it is no longer confined to their own breast, but circulated for the information of all interested in our nation's welfare, and more particularly that of the Navy. The Report of the Royal Commission recommends the restoration of the Widows' Pensions, and to be made retrospective, we are very creditably informed that the Admiralty have likewise strongly recommended it, that it is now with the Treasury, and we are daily expecting to see it promulgated; for 29 years the Widows' Pensions have been withheld, this again restored, will cause many a Widow's heart to rejoice, and the Fatherless to leap for joy, and thousands yet unborn will have cause to praise God that he has so disposed the hearts of some to labor for and accomplish this great object. Position or Rank next Second Masters is restoring to the Class what they were deprived of in 1844, and that which has been to old and faithful servants one of the sharpest thorns in their path, this will enable the class in future to do their duty with that zeal they were once accustomed to. There are many points in the Memorial that have not been adverted to in the Report, which we trust to see in the Queen's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions that are now being revised, whether they are or not, we should hope that as a Class they will be satisfied that there is no fault with those selected to represent the Class, but that the best means has been used by them to accomplish the end in view, viz., the promotion and welfare of the Class. And that which is yet lacking, we would say to all, be united, never cease to labor for that which is right, and "let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not," so wrote the great Apostle, and so believe's your humble servant.

T. H. H.

Portsmouth, April, 1859.

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

1880
 Michigan, 1880 (continued in 1880)

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

none

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

VA
454
N38

The Navy

